THE
MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

o. 4 DECEMBER Vol. XXXIX

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

ope Pacificus and His Holy Year

An article contributed to the *Times* (October 31) has elicited a ignificant correspondence. The contributor of the article affirms he urgent need for the Papal Church and the non-Papal Christian odies to create a united front against Marxian secularism. He rites :

> 'The struggle against Marxian paganism, in which the Roman Church has given so unequivocal a lead, is creating a common Christian sympathy. There is much to support the view that the time is now ripe for re-examining the relations between Rome and the other Christian bodies.'
>
> 'The Holy Year which Pope Pius is shortly to inaugurate may well prove more momentous than any in the Church's history . . . There is widespread hope that Rome will make a gesture to the Christian world in keeping with the realities of the hour.'

The article is obviously written by one possessed, not only of uch inside knowledge but also of authority to speak as a repre- entative of the Papal Curia. The comments on the article by four nglican bishops (Winchester, Melanesia (retired), Rangoon etired), Down and Dromore), in the correspondence which has ollowed in the *Times* indicates the significance which is attached y Anglicans to this papal gesture.

1. Winchester

Sir,

The article in *The Times* which gave rise to the correspondence on Catholicism in your columns contained by implication a plea that those 'who acknowledge Christ as Lord' should 'confer together about their differences and how best they can give effect to such principles as are held in common.'

Most of the letters thus far have come from Roman Catholics and many of them have stated once again the Roman interpretation of New Testament evidence on which the exclusive claims of the Roman Church are based. Their authors must be well aware that to members of the

Anglican Communion and the Orthodox Churches, to name no others, this interpretation appears unconvincing and even erroneous. I cannot think that argument and counter-argument on this subject in your columns will at present carry us further, while it may well divert attention from the plea suggested in your original article. On the other hand, it seems to me significant that several of your Roman correspondents recognise the need and possibility of closer relations and closer co-operation with those who differ from them; and I am confident that any approach in this direction by the authorities of the Roman Communion will meet with an immediate and welcoming response from our side.

If recently there has been less co-operation than there was a few years back between Roman Catholics and Anglicans in this country, it has not been due to any stiffening on the part of the Church of England or indeed the Free Churches, but to what has seemed to us, perhaps mistakenly, a deliberate withdrawal of late from this field by the authorities of the Church of Rome in this country, and to the painful discovery, made a few years back, how short a distance, in apparent obedience to their own beliefs, Roman Catholics seemed able to go. Roman Catholics cannot, it appears, always be permitted even to join with others who acknowledge Christ as Lord in saying our Lord's own prayer at a public meeting, and, I am informed, have even been forbidden on occasion to join with others in silent prayer before a joint meeting. Not long ago in Bournemouth the Roman organisers were in two minds whether, when their own bishop had closed a previous joint meeting by giving his blessing, I could be allowed to close the following meeting by giving mine.

It may well be that devotion is the wrong sphere in which, owing to our dogmatic differences, to expect co-operation to be possible at present; but, if there can be no co-operation there, co-operation in other directions feels in experience to be frozen at the start. This correspondence, I respectfully suggest, will serve a most useful purpose if it encourages the Roman authorities in this country (1) to decide whether they really desire closer co-operation with their fellow Christians and, if so, what forms, in accordance with their own principles, such co-operation can be allowed to take; and (2) to let their conclusions be publicly known. At the present time, in my judgment, no charge of unwillingness to co-operate in giving effect to Christian principles can fairly be brought against either the Anglican Communion or the majority of Free Churchmen.

I am, Sir your obedient servant,

Wolvesey, Winchester. MERVYN WINTON

November 9th.

2. MELANESIA

SIR,

Your article on Catholicism is a welcome invitation at the present time. I am confident that I voice the desire of many in the Church of England that the authority of the Western Church would sanction round-table meetings between the members of the Roman Catholic Church and the Church of England. It is understood at the outset that the purpose of these meetings is not compromise of any kind. Such knowledge as members of the Church of England have of the Roman Catholic Church is in the main very uninformed. The faith of the Catholic Church is to be found in the liturgy and service books of the Church. Books of all

kinds by Roman Catholic writers are written and read and quoted. They bear the imprimatur of the authorities and are quoted as representing the faith of the Church. The imprimatur is generally taken to mean that the book contains nothing contrary to the faith of the Church. No opinion is expressed on pious opinions within the book. Historically, it is in part through the free circulation of pious opinions that the evolution of doctrine under the guidance of the Holy Spirit is brought to focus and to formal statement.

The primacy of the Roman Church is readily acknowledged as a matter of history. First in the early centuries and then in these later days the Roman Church has maintained the 'faith once delivered to the saints' without compromise with changing thought. Many will say it has made accretions but it has not made deductions. Also it has maintained standards of morality in face of attempts to lower them. Most Christians are sincerely thankful for this whether they are members of the Roman Catholic Communion or not. The disastrous effect of the lowering of moral standards and of the manifold private judgments has become clear. There is a wide-spread desire, and a new sincerity in the desire, that the way may be opened for renewal of communion between Rome and England.

It is difficult to see how this historical schism is to be bridged except by clear explanations. In round-table conference these may be given, questions may be asked and answered, and under the guidance of the Holy Spirit the way may be opened for the next step. There will be separation of essentials from non-essentials and of truth from misconceptions and even falsehoods. Again we emphasise that there is no thought or desire for anything that is suggested by the word compromise. With the increase of knowledge there will be a penitence on chapters of history. This is obvious to those who read Church history. It is not for us to speak about penitence for others than ourselves. An accompaniment of penitence is humility. This can be left to higher guidance.

Yours faithfully,

CECIL J. WOOD, Bishop

Malvern.

November 8th.

3. RANGOON

SIR,

We all long for the fulfilment of what we believe is Our Lord's will that his Church should be one organised body throughout the world, and the practical need of such unity was never greater than it is to-day. But among Christians this unity must be achieved by fellowship, not domination ('One is your teacher but all ye are brethren'). When Rome foregoes her claim to issue 'infallible' decrees and offers the free fellowship that is characteristic of the Gospel and a necessary condition of entry into truth she will go far to establish her claim to be the centre of the world-wide Church.

Yours faithfully,

R. S. FYFFE, *Bishop*

Honeybrook House, Franche, Kidderminster.

November 8th.

4. DOWN AND DROMORE

SIR,

Pope Pius XI in his encyclical 'On fostering true religious union' makes clear the conditions of union with his Church. His words are: 'All who are truly Christ's believe, for example, the Conception of the Mother of God without stain of original sin with the same faith as they believe the mystery of the August Trinity, and the Incarnation of our Lord just as they do the infallible teaching authority of the Roman Pontiff, according to the sense in which it was defined by the Oecumenical Council of the Vatican.' My object in writing is to call attention to a course of lectures in which the Papal claims, as defined at the Vatican Council of 1870, are examined with supreme lucidity, learning, and balance. The book is 'The Infallibility of the Church' by Dr. Salmon, Provost of Trinity College Dublin. The grave themes treated in this correspondence are there dealt with in so masterly a fashion that the reader may well conclude—*causa finita est.*

Yours, etc.,

WILLIAM DOWN AND DROMORE

The See House,
Knockdene Park South, Belfast.

These episcopal letters represent responsible and understanding Anglicanism at the present time. How much more sympathetic Anglicanism is to the Papacy than it was four centuries ago. In those days our Church's Litany contained the petition:

> 'From the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome and all his detestable enormities, *Good Lord deliver us.*'

Many years ago that petition was removed from our Prayer Book and it was thereafter authorised that at such times as the Litany is not appointed to be said the Collect for all sorts and conditions of men shall be used in which

> 'We pray for the good estate of the Catholic Church; that it may be so guided and governed by thy good Spirit, that all who profess and call themselves Christians may be led into the way of truth, and hold the faith in unity of spirit, in the bond of peace, and in righteousness of life.'

We doubt to-day if any Anglican priest would refuse communion to any Roman Catholic communicant. It seems to us that on the devotional side there is nothing further that Anglicans can do in promoting communion with Rome.

Of course on the dogmatic side, the Decrees of the Vatican Council of 1870 as cited above by the Bishop of Down and Dromore have rendered dogmatic agreement hopeless.

On the church order side agreement is equally hopeless whilst the Pope, as the Vicar of Christ in addition to his claims of infallibility, adds those of absolute authority over other churches. It must be borne in mind however that at the present moment the

foreshadowed Roman gesture is not aimed at reunion but at co-operation with Rome in her conflict with Marxian secularism.

Whilst the English Church is ever ready to oppose religious persecution it is faced by a very real difficulty in uniting with Rome in any anti-persecution campaign directed against secularism. We English Churchmen to-day (whatever our sins have been in the past in the practice of persecution) absolutely renounce the right and duty to persecute in the cause of religion. The Pope has not done this and until he has done it, we must regard him as an undesirable and indeed detrimental ally in an anti-persecution campaign. The tolerant cannot here unite with the intolerant.

It may be replied: Why demand this papal renunciation? We are no longer living in the days of Foxe's *Book of Martyrs* and Charles Kingsley's *Westward Ho*. The Papacy has long since ceased to practise persecution. That may be for the reason given by Spurgeon and John Bunyan — lack of power. There is a sinister saying:

> *In subjection, the Papacy is a lamb: as a rival, a fox: when supreme, a tiger.*

We have no hesitation in believing that the Archbishop of Canterbury would unite with the Pope in making such a declaration although we recognise that it is easier for the Primate of a Church professing fallibility to do this than for the Head of an infallible Church.

To be quite plain, before we can support co-operation with the Papacy in response to its gesture we wish to be sure that the Papacy is out for the rights of religious freedom everywhere and not simply out to protect and assert papal freedom. There have been certain happenings of recent years in Abyssinia and in Spain which may leave even ardent sympathisers with the Papacy in doubt as to where the Papacy really stands in this issue of religious toleration.

Tu es Petrus

The *Times* correspondence on the forthcoming papal gesture elicited the following letter (November 5) from the editor of the *Spectator* (Wilson Harris, M.P.):

> Sir,
>
> The closing words of Dr. C. S. Carter's letter in *The Times* of to-day raise a question (by no means new) which seems to deserve some further attention. 'The Catholic Church,' he writes, 'cannot forget the words spoken at her creation, *Tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram aedificabo Ecclesiam meam.*' On that it must be observed that Christ did not speak in Latin (if he had it would not have been in fourth-century Latin) nor

in Greek, which is the language in which his words have come down to us, but in Aramaic. The accuracy of the translation from the one tongue to the other we have little or no means of judging. Moreover the Gospels (except the third) were written by relatively uncultured men at least twenty to thirty years after the events recounted took place, and the inevitable inaccuracies no one can say how many times, are as late, apart from one or two inconsiderable fragments, as the fourth century A.D. The inferential existence, behind the Gospels, of Q and some collections of sayings of Christ carries us little farther. How in such circumstances is it possible to rest a doctrine, let alone an organised Church, on a single isolated sentence attributed to Christ? The *Tu es Petrus* sentence, moreover, if it really had the tremendous import now assigned to it, would surely have been reported by every one of the Evangelists, or at least by all three Synoptists. Actually it is given by only one, St. Matthew—not by St. Mark, who is generally assumed to have derived much of his information from St. Peter himself. St. Paul, who provides the earliest extant records of Christ, and in whose life-time a Christian Church had begun to take shape, knows nothing of the *Tu es Petrus* charge. St. Luke, who relates the same coversation as St. Matthew in almost the same words, says nothing of any address to St. Peter individually.

None of this, of course, jeopardises in the smallest degree belief in the Gospel story as a whole. The coherence and consistency of the narratives of the Synoptists and St. John, and the references in St. Paul's epistles, carry their own irresistible conviction. It is reliance on individual sentences and phrases which imperils belief, because any claim to their verbal authenticity is so obviously vulnerable—even though they may often epitomise admirably teaching to which the Gospel narrative as a whole bears compelling testimony. I write neither as an ecclesiastic nor as a scholar, but it was, after all, to common men that the Gospel was preached.

The value of this letter is not that it contributes anything new to what is already known but that it expresses the standpoint of an educated English layman.

In view of the different interpretations by Patristic commentators, we cannot be sure what the Petrine passage actually means. What we can be sure of is that the Petrine passage occurs in one Gospel only and that Gospel relates certain incredible incidents such as Peter walking on the water and his catching the fish with the tax money in its mouth, intended to exhibit the unique relation of St. Peter to his Master.

Another thing that we can be quite sure of is that the Petrine passage if ever uttered by Christ was not intended to confer the primacy of the Christian Church on the Bishops of Rome. St. Peter has real claims to be regarded as the Founder of the Church in Jerusalem and also as the Founder of the Church in Antioch but there is no convincing historical evidence that he was the Founder of the Church in Rome or its apostolic head.

The Church of Rome was not governed by a monarchical Bishop until nearly a century after the martyrdom of St. Peter. Historically the pre-eminence achieved by the Bishops of Rome was due to the fact that they were the Bishops of the Christian Church in the capital of the Roman Empire. A Church which early became possessed of great resources and was ruled by a succession of bishops endowed with outstanding gifts of leadership, courage and liberality. When Hobbes described the papacy as 'the ghost of the Roman Empire sitting crowned on the grave thereof,' he at least uttered a half-truth. Had Rome not been the capital of the Roman Empire the Bishops of Rome would not have become the Metropolitans of Latin Christendom. It was not St. Peter's legacy but Pagan Rome's legacy which created the Papacy.

The Papal inheritance was twofold: that which it derived from the Christian Religion and that which it derived from Imperial Rome. If *Tu es Petrus* etc., inscribed around the dome of St. Peter's recognises the Church's Christian legacy it ought to have another citation recognising its imperial legacy.

> '*Tu regere inperio populos, Romano, memento*' (Aeneid vi, 851).
> 'Tis thine O Rome to rule
> This mission ne'er forego.'

But how different the history of Latin Christendom might have been if the words attributed to St. Peter in 1 *Peter* v: 1-3 had been selected as the motto of the Church which claims St. Peter as its founder:

> 'The presbyters which are among you I exhort who am your fellow-presbyter; feed the flock of God . . . not for filthy lucre nor as lords over God's heritage but as ensamples to the flock.'

Let us hope that the spirit of these words will be reflected in the momentous papal utterance of the Holy Year.

The Basic Christian Quadrilateral

The following weighty letter was contributed to the *Times* of November 15th by the Roman Catholic Coadjutor Bishop of Brentwood.

> Sir,
>
> The correspondence on 'Catholicism To-day' has raised two issues which should not be confused. The first is concerned with co-operation between Christians in social, economic and international matters where it is expected that Christians might speak with a common voice and act with a common purpose. The desire for such Christian co-operation has been expressed by both Catholic and non-Catholic in these columns. One cannot but approve a general aim of this kind. The working-out in detail is, however, much more difficult. I joined the 'Sword of the Spirit' movement in 1941, and for some years had the honour to be

the late Cardinal Hinsley's personal representative on its executive committee. I was secretary also to the Hitchin Joint Christian Council, and, after 1944, was a Catholic representative on the Nottingham Christian Front. At different times attempts were made to formulate an agreed statement and to work out an agreed plan of action on the following subjects: religious toleration; equality of opportunity for parents wishing their children to receive denominational instruction in school; the morality of artificial insemination; the morality of betting, pools, and lotteries; the persecution of Christians in eastern Europe; the morality of contraception and the manufacture and selling of contraceptives; a Christian statement at a peace rally. On all these matters it was found impossible to reach agreement on a statement or a line of policy. So far as I remember we had only one success, when the Bishop of St. Albans took up, in the House of Lords, the question of the direction by a local official of the Ministry of Labour of a young married woman to a firm engaged in the manufacture of contraceptives. Apart from this, my experience has been that united Christian action goes off at half-cock.

The other issue, orginally raised by your Special Correspondent and referred to specifically by the Bishop of Winchester, is concerned with religious unity and the question of some form of 'reunion.' On this point the Catholic contributors to this correspondence have been unanimous. May I make clear two points?

(*a*) For a Catholic there can be no such thing as 'essential' and 'non-essential' articles of faith. The motive for his belief is not the intellectual content of the proposition but the fact that it is a proposition accepted on the authority of God who reveals it. In this sense there is no difference between the Catholic's acceptance of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception and his belief in the divinity of Christ. To him both propositions are true because they have been revealed by God. Any 'concession' would, therefore, from the Catholic point of view, be a betrayal. To ask a Catholic to consider such a concession would be similar to asking a teacher of arithmetic to make 'concessions' in the results of the multiplication table for the sake of pupils who got into a muddle over their sums. This would be charitable, perhaps, but would be neither good teaching nor good arithmetic, and would eventually lead to chaos. The Catholic holds that the Christian doctrines are as certain as the results of the multiplication table, though for different reasons. To make concessions on them means chaos: and he may be forgiven for thinking that this is what has happened among so many Christian bodies at the present time. Stiffening-up is not achieved by watering down.

(*b*) I should like to assure the Bishop of Winchester that the difficulties he has encountered with regard to joint prayer arise from this Catholic position, which may perhaps seem to be held rigidly, but is held in all humility and sanity and without arrogance. United prayer, if it is to mean anything at all, must be an expression of united minds. But a Catholic and a non-Catholic saying the Lord's Prayer could not have united minds or mean the same thing. The Catholic saying, for example, 'Thy Kingdom come,' would be praying for the conversion of all men to Catholicism; the non-Catholic, evidently, would not subscribe to this petition. It would pain the Bishop of Winchester that Catholics should be dubious about his giving a blessing at a joint meeting. But their attitude is the logical outcome of their belief that, so far as they

are concerned, and from their point of view, the Bishop of Winchester is a layman.

Surely it is better in all these matters to be quite frank and not to start, with wishful thinking, on courses which lead sooner or later to frustration and dead-ends. There is need for defence of human values at the present time, and such a campaign should attract all men of good will. What specifically Christian contribution can be given by each communion must arise from within that communion. It would be a mistake to expect such identity of outlook as to achieve common action even in social and economic matters which so often have a moral background. To look for 'reunion' in religion except on the conditions explained by Pope Pius XII in the encyclical *Mortalium Animos,* is to look for a will-o'-the-wisp.

The importance of this letter for the purposes of the coming papal gesture consists in its writer's knowledge of papal doctrinal claims and definitions and also in his intimate experience of the practical difficulties encountered by those Roman Catholics and non-Roman Catholics attempting to co-operate in promoting Christian practice in the life of present-day England.

Many who read the Bishop of Brentwood's letter will feel that from the point of view of practical co-operation between papalists and non-papalists the prospects are hopeless.

The Bishop of Brentwood's letter was followed next day by a letter from another Roman Catholic — Dom Columba Cary-Elwes much more conciliatory in tone and optimistic in outlook. In it he writes:

On the Catholic side we are aware of the Church's errors in the past and of her human limitations in the present, and appreciate the difficulties of Anglicans in the doctrinal field. We readily admit the decay of the fifteenth century Papacy, the scandal of Indulgences, the illiteracy of the clergy in times past. We sense the strangeness of many devotions and outlandish theological conclusions to the ears of 'Anglo-Saxons.' The way to reunion is not however to be found by magnifying the difficulties still less by a process of bargaining, which is unthinkable. It can only be achieved by a search which goes deeper than polemics, deeper than any particular point of controversy raised, though these things can be and should be thrashed out in friendly discussion. The fundamental point should always be kept in view: the nature and functions of Christ's Church. It would seem, then, that the time had indeed come for a rapprochement; and perhaps the authorities of both Churches could countenance and bless discussions between theologians from both sides.

In conclusion, I venture to assert that the Reformation, it is true, began with a conscious act of disobedience to the Papacy, and that in consequence discussions have been almost always upon this apologetic plane. But the break was really due to something deeper, a lack of love; for those who broke away loved the Papacy no more. It had in some respects become an unlovely thing. The return, then, will be through love, and that will flower into obedience. For love in practice means obedience not only to Christ but to the Church which is Christ still living in the world. We can exaggerate the significance of Peter and his

> successor by forgetting the whole Church which is also guided by the Spirit which is Truth. The gates of hell shall not prevail against it. The early Fathers had not worked out the uniqueness of the Papacy: they had, however, seen the uniqueness of the Church. Perhaps this is the way of the return. Compared with this great study of the nature of the Church's role, all the rest falls into insignificance. Let us all, who share the grace of Christ, if not the oneness of His mind, love the Church whose speech is unerring; and we shall yet see the reunion of Christendom; for God is with us — He prayed for that unity.

When Dom Columba emphasises the basic importance of Truth and Love in bringing the Church of Rome and the Church of England into closer co-operation and more cordial relations, we heartily agree with him, but when he affirms that 'love in practice means obedience not only to Christ but to the Church which is Christ still living in the world' serious problems arise.

It is not possible in view of its history to identify the Church with Christ. We cannot identify the flock with the shepherd. It is in the following of the Shepherd by His flock that the unity of the flock is secured.

When stressing the basic character of Truth and Love as needful for Christian Reunion Dom Columba makes no reference to Freedom. Such New Testament statements as 'Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is Liberty' and 'With freedom did Christ set us free' emphasise a quality in the Christian Religion which Papalism has increasingly restricted in its endeavours to maintain religious unity.

If we are to secure Christian reunion it can only be by the increase of love, truth and freedom among all Christian bodies. Inasmuch as the Papal Church is the largest Church in Christendom it is immensely important that it should lead Christendom in this ascent; but how is it possible for it to do so?

In attempting to suggest a papal policy it is most important at the outset to distinguish between the Papal Curia and the Papal Church as a whole. The debt that Christendom owes to the Roman Catholic Church is great indeed. Its propagandist zeal, its self-sacrificing service, its unflinching faith in the victory of the Christian Religion, its child-like piety, its absolute belief in the reality of the spiritual world inspire the reverence of many who are unable to experience the same feeling towards the Papal Curia and its policy. Such dissentients feel compelled not only in the interests of the Christian Religion but also in the interests of the Roman Catholic Church itself to criticise and condemn various papal pretensions and policies. They are convinced that it is the dominance of the Papacy which is the most formidable opponent to Roman Catholic co-operation with non-papal Christendom. Yet

they also recognise that it is only the Papacy which can unlock the gate that leads into the Paradise of a united Christendom.

Those who believe in One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church finding its truest expression in the Communion of Saints and in the spiritual fellowship of all Christians may not feel any need for a single terrestrial organisation as the expression of universal Christian Fellowship. They are not at all certain that a single organised corporation would prove the most effective agent in advancing this spiritual and moral unity of mankind.

It is in this sphere, so it seems to us, that the Papacy to-day might take effective action. A patristic writer of the fourth century asserted that he who had not the Church for his mother could not have God for his father. Since then the Papacy has gone further along this road by declaring to all practical intents and purposes that he who has not the Pope for his father cannot have the Church for his mother. This is the *cul de sac* from which papalists and non-papalists desiring reunion must be extricated. But how is this to be done?

At present we have two quadrilaterals prescribed as the basis for Christian unity.

(1) The Vatican Quadrilateral which prescribes for our acceptance:

(*a*) The Supremacy and Infallibility of the Pope,
(*b*) The Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God.
(*c*) The Miracle of the Mass and its expiatory sacrifice for souls in purgatory,
(*d*) The Cultus of the Virgin Mary, the Invocation of Saints and compulsory auricular confession.

(2) The Lambeth Quadrilateral which prescribes for our acceptance:

(*a*) The Bible,
(*b*) The Apostles' and Nicene Creeds,
(*c*) The Two Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper,
(*d*) The historic Episcopate.

Would it not be more effective if, for the purposes of reunion, a basic Christian Quadrilateral were prescribed?

(*a*) The Lord's Prayer,
(*b*) The Two Great Commandments,
(*c*) The Seven Beatitudes,
(*d*) The Parable of the Prodigal Son.

The daily use of the Lord's Prayer, the duty of love to God and man, the recognition of the Blessedness of the Beatitudes, the

converting penitence of the Prodigal Son are central to the Christian Religion and they are the moral and spiritual values which civilisation needs for its welfare and progress. With its centre thus secured a united Christendom might include within its circumference numberless and many-sided, papal and non-papal, organisations in which all are brethren and Christ is Lord.

> 'Ye know,' said Jesus to His Apostles 'that the rulers of the Pagans lord it over them and their great ones exercise authority upon them. Not so shall it be with you.'

Is it not possible that the Pope's Holy Year pronouncement may prescribe such a Basic Christian Quadrilateral as the foundation of Christian Fellowship and as the Way to the Great Return?

Retrospect and Prospect: *Sic et Non*

Does such an optimistic outlook as we have adumbrated in our basic Christian Quadrilateral seem absurd?

Yes and No.

Hastings Rashdall emphasised the need for a standard work on the psychology of corporations. Every great historic corporation, he maintained, had developed in the course of its history a psychology of its own and in every great historic crisis the Corporation acted in accordance with that psychology.

Those who know little of the Papacy describe it as *Semper eadem*. If this be understood of papal institutions, dogmas, rites, it is absurdly unhistorical. In these spheres the Papacy has changed much, and what is more, the Papacy does believe in its own development. Its development however is not achieved by disowning or nullifying its past, but by additions made to it. It is therefore quite possible for papalism to go forward provided it be permitted to ignore, not its affirmations, but some of its injudicious denials which can be transcended by new affirmations.

Of course these new affirmations have to be pronounced by the Pope whose infallibility in the sphere of faith and order gives these affirmations their supreme authority. And here it should be noted that it would be quite possible for the non-papal Christian world to accept these papal affirmations as authoritative without in theory accepting the papal authority as supreme. The non-papal world would accept these papal pronouncements as true not because they claimed to be pronounced by an infallible authority, but because they provided self-evident testimony to their truth.

'He shall take of Mine and shall show it unto you.'

But, in the light of its history, is the papacy at all likely to prescribe such a Christian Quadrilateral?

Although *Semper eadem*, if it be used to describe the history of papal dogmas, institutions, organisations, rites, is misleading, yet if it be used to describe the papal spirit it seems to go to the very heart of papal development. '*Le plus ça change le plus c'est la même chose.*'

It is the right to rule which is the dominant feature of this papal spirit — always an increase of authority with a corresponding decrease of freedom. Hastings Rashdall said:

> That the History of the Papal Church had largely lost interest for him since the publication of the decrees of the Council of Trent; for at Trent the Latin Church had sacrificed her freedom.

Die Weltgeschichte ist das Weltgericht is tragically true of the Papal Church. Only a spiritual miracle could inspire a papal pronouncement such as we have outlined in our basic Christian Quadrilateral.

It is more than doubtful if miracles do occur in the sphere of physics but in the sphere of personality even our scientists will allow that miracles of moral and spiritual conversion are possible.

International Congregationalism

The *Congregational Quarterly*, October, 1949, is largely devoted to the speeches and papers delivered at the recent International Council of Congregationalists held at Wellesley College, Mass., U.S.A. Its membership was composed of representatives drawn from the five continents. Among its British representatives were Dr. Berry (one of the chairmen), Sir Alfred Zimmern, our greatest authority on Internationalism and Sir Oliver Franks, British ambassador to U.S.A.

Among its most influential American members was Professor Reinhold Niebuhr who described himself as 'an adopted stepson of Congregationalism.'

In discussing the constitution and ideals of Congregationalism, Dr. Karl Barth's description of it was cited: 'the free congregation of the free word of God' and he declared that in it 'the ecumenical unity of the Church can be seen more freely than anywhere else.'

In Congregationalism we see exemplified a Christian unity maintained by Christian faith and Christian fellowship without the idea of submission to sovereign authority exercised by the *Corpus Christianum* — an ecumenical Christian unity based on and developed, not by ecclesiastical authority and ecclesiastical regulations but by Christian faith, fellowship and freedom—a Christian unity at the very opposite pole of Papal unity.

Sir Oliver Franks, whose Conference address comes first in the

Congregational Quarterly asks: 'What is the special quality of our Western civilisation which has so altered the relationship of the peoples of the world?' He puts *Hope* first. Other civilisations have put their golden age in the past, others have viewed civilisation as cycles of growth and decline but Western civilisation affirms in the words of Browning: 'The best is yet to be.'

This answer prompts the question what is progress?

Progress, Sir Oliver maintains, is real but it is not automatic and inevitable as the nineteenth century biological evolutionists were in the habit of asserting. 'Progress in human society is something to be achieved painfully and with effort' and this effort is not merely physical and intellectual but also moral and as Sir Oliver Franks emphatically asserts, *spiritual*. Men have been tempted to identify material development with progress but there is a difference between the conditions of progress and progress itself. Sir Oliver appositely quotes Disraeli:

> 'The European talks of progress because by the aid of a few scientific discoveries he has established a society which has mistaken comfort for civilisation.'

To the question: What is the source of the hope in our Western civilisation, Sir Oliver replies:

> 'It derives, I think in the end, from a religious view of the universe.' . . . We have hope because we believe that in this world it is possible through human effort to gain knowledge, create beauty and realise the good . . .
>
> In the last resort our outlook on life depends upon a religious insight.'

It was left to Sir Alfred Zimmern to deliver the concluding address to the Conference.

In dealing with the efforts of the Ecumenical Movement to secure Christian Reunion he stressed the distinction between the Roman Imperialist conception of law as a method of securing and maintaining unity and the modern democratic conception of law 'a civic discipline, self-imposed and self-enforced'—in short, Chartism as attempted by the United Nations. He warned his hearers against the dangers of the federation method of unity since, in the profound axiom of Maitland: 'Power becomes secreted in the interstices of procedure' and so becomes vested in those who administer procedure.

As a consequence, free democratic administration, local experiment, many-sided initiative, ideals of disinterested public service and the spirit of human fellowship and welfare united by unity of aim, are replaced by official bureaucracy, unintelligent uniformity and tyrannical centralisation.

Sir Alfred Zimmern emphasised that what the Ecumenical

Movement needed most at the present time for its expansion was publicity and increasing intercourse among its leaders and agents. With this in view, he urged the creation of new organisations and institutions.

We do not deny that there is value in Sir Alfred's proposals but, as we see it, what the Ecumenical Movement needs most is not more knowledge but more moral courage. Napoleon said: What my admirals have to learn is, that to gain victories it is necessary to take risks. Unless our church leaders feel sure of majorities (and in this they are politicians rather than statesmen) they will not advance but prefer the method of Gilbert's ducal hero who always 'led them from behind.'

Hence, instead of the universal invitation to all Christians to gather forthwith in fellowship at the Lord's Table we have prescribed as a prerequisite to such fellowship, the achievement of agreement upon a number of theological dogmas and ecclesiastical institutions and practices.

Is not such a method of securing Christian unity bound to conflict with the principles of Christian freedom, Christian truth and even Christian love, and is the superficial ecclesiastical uniformity secured at so great a price really worth while? Will not such uniformity check the moral and spiritual evolution of the Christian religion, and as a consequence its powers of leadership and influence in our future civilisation?

We have to-day two ideals of religious unity in conflict with each other. On one side traditional catholic uniformity, and on the other, modern Christian fellowship, and the psychological abyss between the two is impassable, except for the saints. The situation is further complicated by the fact that the adherents of the two conflicting ideals are found intermixed among the separatist ecclesiastical denominations.

Only growing understanding of, and increasing practical loyalty to, the ideals of the Kingdom of God as interpreted by the Spirit of Jesus Christ, can achieve the higher synthesis of which Christian faith has visions from its Delectable Mountains.

The Atomic Bomb and its Threefold Problem

We are heartily tired of the atomic bomb. We cannot get rid of it and we do not know how to use it or whether we ought to use it. The problem of the bomb is threefold: Science and the bomb, Civilisation and the bomb, Christianity and the bomb. An admirable account of the discovery of atomic energy presented stage by stage, illustrated by scientific diagrams, as interesting to the

teacher of science as it is illuminating for the general reader, is to be found in a recently published volume, *The Story of Atomic Energy*, by Professor Frederick Soddy, F.R.S. (Nova Atlantis, London, 1949).

Professor Soddy sums up the aim and achievement of his volume as follows, and those who read it will feel that his claim is justified :

> ' The book is written in the hope of dispelling the view that the subject is too difficult to be seriously studied except by experts. The object of natural philosophy has always been to reduce the material world to simplicity, and though paradoxically for so many centuries the effort led always to ever-increasing complexity, that goal has now been suddenly and dramatically reached. Any intelligent person not out to obfuscate new ideas and principles, but prepared, like the scientist, to accept them even when they are not yet fully comprehensible or even mutually consistent, because they have led to a new undeniable truth of the most profound importance to humanity, is as able to tackle the subject as the expert.'

The problem of the use or misuse of atomic energy for purposes of warfare is lucidly and brilliantly treated by Kathleen Lonsdale, D.Sc., F.R.S., in a little pamphlet entitled *Russia's Atom Bomb* (The Fellowship of Reconciliation, 38 Gordon Square, London, W.C.1). The problem arises from the fact that the fissile material needful for the production of the atomic bomb can be used either for industrial or for military purposes. This in its turn creates a moral situation in which full oft the means to do ill deeds makes ill deeds to be done. Dr. Lonsdale puts it thus :

> ' The essential difficulty . . . is that the material obtained . . . is the *very material out of which atomic bombs are made;* while even the beneficial use of this same material for atomic power production gives, as an *inevitable by-product,* the radioactive and terribly poisonous " fission products " ; and these would themselves be a dangerous weapon, less spectacular but more insidious than atomic bombs, once a way of delivering them had been devised. So that a nation which had atomic power plants would have at hand a means whereby, with a minimum of delay and difficulty, atomic bombs and other atomic weapons *could* be prepared, should the powers-that-be decide to do so. Schemes for ' denaturation ' such as were outlined in the Acheson-Lilienthal report of 1946 might delay such a conversion, but could not prevent it.'

Hence agreements to accept international inspection possess, so Dr. Lonsdale maintains, very little value as a preventive to the use of atomic energy for military purposes should war break out. She writes :

> ' This confusion of industrial and military interests means that any scheme of international inspection that might be devised would have to be so far-reaching as to include the whole of the economic development of all participating powers. Even so, should war break out, and should all nations have adhered quite faithfully to any agreement to destroy all their atomic weapons, the country in the most favourable position for

their quick production would be that country which had most industrial atomic power installations. The Baruch Plan therefore proposed (following the Lilienthal Report) that an *international body*, the Atomic Development Authority (A.D.A.) should have (1) complete control of the world supplies of uranium and thorium and of all mining and refining operations connected therewith;

(2) complete control of the construction and operation of all atomic reactors and separation plants, especially of those which would run at high temperatures suitable for the generation of electrical power.'

This international control and administration of the world's atomic energy by an international representative corporation would be bound to insist on restrictions which Russia would almost certainly veto. Here's the rub. Why should Russia not agree? The answer is simple. Russia would claim that if her atomic energy plants were not equal in number to those possessed by the Powers of the Atlantic Pact she would be attacked and overwhelmed by the capitalist forces of the world. On the other hand, the social democratic States suspect that if Russia's atomic energy plants were larger in number than those possessed by the Atlantic Pact Powers, those Powers would certainly be attacked by Russia. In other words, mutual suspicion and distrust preclude effectively any secure plan for the expulsion of the use of atomic energy in warfare.

Obviously the only remedy is the creation of an atmosphere of good feeling and mutual trust between the totalitarian Communist forces on the one side and the social democratic forces on the other. Dr. Lonsdale thinks that the development of commerce between the two groups will assist to solve the problem. No doubt it will assist, but it cannot by itself achieve absolute security. Russia's 'iron curtain,' Russia's unscrupulous press campaigns, Russia's use of the veto in U.N.O., Russia's failure to keep her word, Russia's underground revolutionary plotting in the social democratic States, Russia's 'cold war' cannot be brought to an end merely by the development of commercial intercourse between her and the social democratic States. We cannot trust Russia. We wish we could.

This is no new situation. The Pendjeh cartoon in a nineteenth-century *Punch*, in which Mr. Gladstone says to the Russian bear: 'Oh, but you promised you would not touch that honey,' and the bear replies with a smirk: 'But why did you believe me when I promised?' illustrates a Russia whose political policy is to break her word and to feel no shame in so doing. The only wise course is for the social democratic States to face Russia with such a combination of power that nothing short of insanity could seduce Russia into attacking them.

It is a deeply disappointing situation when moral and spiritual forces are held in check by the immoralists. But the Christian Religion has been there before, and the combination of preparedness for war as the best means of securing peace, united to rational, moral and spiritual education, is the only remedy. But it is a very exacting remedy, demanding great self-control and great economic sacrifices.

The practical statesmen of the Atlantic Pact need no exhortation that to secure success in their task of peace-making their statesmanship must unite Christian values with the achievements of modern science. Reliance upon either of these in isolation means disaster.

The Book of Uncommon Prayer

The Rev. Frank Moyle is convinced that the best way to celebrate the four-hundredth anniversary of our *Book of Common Prayer* is to provide English Church people with a new Prayer Book, not of Uncommon prayer as our Prayer Book has become, but of modern, popular devotions, inspiringly educational and intensely real. His plea, voiced in his little volume *The Book of Uncommon Prayer*,[1] has the influential support of Dr. Raven, Regius Professor of Theology and Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge University. He writes:

> 'Much that he (Mr. Moyle) has to say was familiar to the older ones among us in the years when Prayer Book Revision was a "live" subject. In those days there were some who urged the sort of "root and branch" policy which he advocates and who begged the bishops to discuss the research into the ways in which twentieth-century man could best worship God rather than to negotiate a bargain whereby if Evangelicals made certain concessions Anglo-Catholics would meet them half-way. The deserved failure of the episcopal compromise in 1928 damped down what enthusiasm there had been for the subject and since then those who were interested have either taken the law into their own hands or else accepted the Book of Common Prayer as legally obligatory and aesthetically if not intellectually or religiously satisfying. The latter alternative has been tolerated because of the wave of reactionary and obscurantist theology which has swept over episcopal and clerical circles in England in the past twenty years.'

Although Dr. Raven is not able to go all the way with Mr. Moyle in some of his proposals and criticisms, he commends warmly Mr. Moyle's constructive criticisms and positive proposals.

> 'His attitude far from being merely negative discloses religious and theological convictions which are far more attractive, consistent and Christian than the ideas which he condemns.'

[1] *The Book of Uncommon Prayer*, by Frank W. Moyle, Rector of Allesley, Coventry. (Andrew Drakes Ltd., London. 1949. 8/6.)

> 'He succeeds beyond all question in showing that this "cabinet of theological antiquities," however beautiful and historically interesting, now contains very few objects of present practical use. In displaying their defects he demonstrates what are the principles which should determine the character of their successors. Moreover, he shows how vitally important it is that we should cease to acquiesce in anachronisms and with what speed we should insist upon the modernising of our whole method of worship.' (p. 7)

Not the least valuable of Mr. Moyle's sections deals with the need for a new Catechism in which the attempt is made to answer its questions in the actual words of Jesus Christ. It would be of immense value for young people to learn by heart a number of the profoundest sayings of Jesus Himself.

Mr. Moyle gives his readers a fine definition of prayer derived from the Gospels — 'Strengthen your brethren' (p. 146). This ought to be the dominant ideal for those whose duty it is to compile and authorise a Book of Common Prayer, and the 'brethren' should include those outside the Church as well as those within it. It is because Mr. Moyle is impelled by this ideal and the urgent need of realising it practically that he has written this courageous volume.

It is interesting to compare with Mr. Moyle's book the reflections and valuations of Dean Matthews in his article entitled 'The Nation and the Prayer Book' in the *Hibbert Journal* (Robert Hibbert Centenary Number, October 1949). Mr. Moyle's point of view is that of a strenuous parish priest in a provincial town : Dean Matthews' point of view is that of a cathedral dignitary and Professor of Philosophy in the Metropolis.

The Dean values our Prayer Book, and not least of all the 1928 Deposited Book, much more highly than does Mr. Moyle. He cites Dr. Brillioth, 'an eminent Lutheran divine,' as declaring 'that the 1928 Prayer Book is the best liturgy in Christendom.' Dr. Matthews is of opinion that Parliament made a grievous mistake in rejecting the 1928 Book, for this constituted

> 'the veto of the State on the attempt of the Church to adapt its form of worship to the needs of the modern world and to promote reasonable order.'

But he adds :

> 'The course taken by the Bishops in this emergency was, in my view, even more unfortunate than the emergency itself.'

What the Bishops ought to have done after the second rejection (this is our view, not the Dean's) was to withdraw their alternative Holy Communion Service from the 1928 Book and then present the Book a third time to the House of Commons. We are convinced

that in this form it would have been passed by a large majority.

However, the general view of Churchmen to-day is that the 1928 Book ought to make way for something better. This was certainly the view of Dr. Dearmer and other understanding liturgiologists. This is also the view, we believe, of Dean Matthews, but he looks upon the solution of the problem with a more philosophic eye that does Mr. Moyle.

> 'A loyal Anglican who sees the value of his inheritance and also the need for developing it must work patiently for the time when in the unity of the Spirit we shall be prepared to take up again the task of the Prayer Book.' (p. 22)

Our own solution, and it is no new one, is that we should retain our 1662 Book unaltered with the exception of including in it the Holy Communion Office of the First Prayer Book of King Edward VI to be used as an alternative when desired by our Anglo-Catholic brethren.

In addition, to meet our urgent liturgical needs to-day, especially in our vast new parishes, we plead that at the earliest opportunity a popular, practical, modern Prayer Book should be issued whose services might be substituted on all occasions where alternatives to the 1662 services are desired and on a number of other occasions for which no services are provided in the 1662 Book. There is much more need for this than for a Book of Revised Canons.

THE CREED OF CHRISTENDOM

MY purpose is to suggest that the ideal basis for the practical union of Christians of all denominations is to be found in the Lord's Prayer.

The Lord's Prayer is probably the best authenticated of all utterances of the Founder of Christianity; its use is common to all Christian churches throughout the world; and, as I hope to show, it sets forth a complete and consistent theory of the universe, of Man's place therein, and of his duties, in a logical order, beginning with the existence and nature of God, and deriving thence the right basis for Man's thought and will and action.

There is no need to dwell on the dangers that threaten Christian ideals and standards to-day, nor on the imperative need for a united front to withstand them. I believe that the Lord's Prayer contains by implication all that is essential to those ideals and standards, and that if Christians could make it their rallying point for common defence, reserving their right to hold and to

each such additional doctrines as are distinctive of their several churches, they would be in a far stronger position to meet the common enemy.

With this purpose in view, I propose to consider the prayer clause by clause.

Our Father which art in Heaven

These words imply that the Universe is governed by a Person to whom we are by our nature akin, and whose abode is the ideal, eternal world, transcending the limits of time and space; that by virtue of our kinship with him, we are all brothers, and all in a measure participators in His infinite being. How far does our knowledge and experience support these assumptions?

The more man learns about himself and the world in which he lives, the more clearly he discovers that he is an integral part of a universe that corresponds with his own nature. He is no foundling, deposited in an alien world, but a child of the family, growing up in his own home. As his own character unfolds and develops, he learns more of the power from whom that character is derived, and discovers that those elements in himself which he feels to be most real and valuable are also those which are most necessary to any intelligible conception of an ordered universe.

Primitive man looked out upon a world that seemed strange, even hostile; his terrors were reflected in his magical cults. Gradually, with the growth of knowledge, he began to perceive his kinship with the rest of creation. He learned that he was an animal, with a body differing in detail from those of other animals, but formed on the same principles and subject to the same laws. Further knowledge revealed that the life of animal and vegetable is akin; that all are composed of the same elements as the inanimate world; that all matter is essentially the same. Physically, man beongs to his environment; and, with increasing knowledge of, and power over, the material nature which he shares with it, he becomes more and more at home in his world.

Next, as he begins to consider the operations of his own mind, he finds these too reflected in the structure of the universe. The pattern of the world, so far as man has been able to grasp it, is a rational, intelligible pattern. The laws of nature and the laws of thought show an intimate correspondence. 'The Great Architect of the Universe,' wrote Sir James Jeans, 'now begins to appear as a pure mathematician.' In whatever direction man turns his mind — mathematics, mechanics, art — he finds the universe responding to the furthest development of his thought.

What of Man's moral nature? Can it be said that here too he is knit closely into the fabric of the whole? Here the reply is, at first sight, more doubtful. He sees nature 'red in tooth and claw.' Living creatures, in order to maintain their own existence, pursue and destroy one another; fear, pain and extinction seem to be the ever-present shadows of hope, pleasure and life. The laws that govern human life too seem framed in utter disregard of the principles which the best of mankind have propounded and the general conscience has accepted. So far, we are indeed one with our environment. We live by the destruction of other life; we all bear our share of the collective injustice, suffering and strife which seem inseparable from human society. The best of men exists on terms which his conscience must deplore, but from which he cannot escape.

Yet there is another side to the picture. As there has been progress in man's intellectual life, with a corresponding progress in his recognition of the intellectual element in his environment, so there has been progress in his ethical development, with a corresponding discovery of a moral law governing the universe. Disregarding temporary and local retrogressions, we may fairly claim that standards of thought and conduct which used to be regarded as praiseworthy are now generally condemned. The ferocious morality of parts of the Old Testament has been outgrown; slavery has been abolished in our more civilised human communities; the rights of man as man, apart from sex or colour, are beginning to be recognised, at least in theory. If recent years have seen some dark pages of human history, they have also seen them condemned by the mass of mankind. Man has raised, and is raising, the general level of his moral consciousness.

As he has done so, he has begun to be aware of two facts. First, that in the world of nature there are to be found the rudiments of human virtue; that, besides the law of strife, there is also in the living world the law of co-operation and love, and that, as life reaches higher levels, the latter tends to supersede the former. Secondly, that the human world is ultimately one, and that the virtues which are needed for the survival of family, tribe or nation cannot be restricted in their application. The impoverishment of one nation is a loss to all; the victors in war must rebuild with their hands what they have destroyed; hate and enmity lead to disaster in the end. We are, in truth, members of one family; the power that is not ourselves does make for righteousness; man's highest nature does work in harmony with the universal law.

Does this correspondence between Man and the Universe, which

we have traced through the material, mental and moral spheres, imply the possession by the Universe of what we call personality? To answer this question, we must consider the part played by the personal subject in creating the world of experience.

The scene reflected in a mirror changes according to the position of the observer; in other words, the picture shown on the mirror's surface depends partly on the objects from which the light is thrown on to that surface, and partly on the position of the subject who sees it. The question, 'What is the surface of the mirror like when nobody is looking at it?' is simply unanswerable, because it is in fact meaningless. This is perhaps the plainest example of the part played by the subject in creating what we commonly regard as a purely 'objective' world. But, as has often been pointed out, all our knowledge of the external world comes to us through our senses, and is therefore to some degree subjective. On the other hand, the variety of our experiences, their mutual corroboration, and the internal coherence of the world which we build upon them, oblige us in practice to postulate an objective basis for them. Neither pure subjective idealism nor pure objective materialism will ultimately 'work.' The only reality that we can conceive seems to be woven of the coming together of subject and object in space and time.

Yet the moment we examine this conclusion we are conscious of its inadequacy. The instant of actual experience is an infinitesimal pin-point; the whole significance of our existence depends on our ability to transcend the immediate present, to live outside the actual here and now. The shortest passage of music, the briefest sentence of prose, the smallest flight of imagination would be impossible apart form this ability. We are immanent in the world of space and time, but we also have the power, to a limited degree, to transcend it, and it is by this power that we give it significance, turning disconnected sounds into music or speech, disordered sights into ordered beauty, the succession of experience and activity into human character.

It seems, then, that the subject-object relationship is of the very essence of reality, and personality a necessary element in the structure of the universe. If this be so, the argument leads directly to the conception of a personal God, immanent in the world yet at the same time transcending it.

Each of us, in a sense, creates his own world; each is also aware of other beings, with worlds of their own which intersect ours. Either these worlds are held together in a universal and eternal order, such as that of which we get glimpses through

science, art, mathematics and ethics, or life is a delusion and the universe a chaos. I can conceive no principle of unity for the wholly other than that interweaving of the warp and woof of subject and object through which my own world is held together.

This interaction of subject and object, which starts on the lowest level with sense-perception, rises through intellectual apprehension until it reaches its consummation in that complete union between personalities, the striving after which we call love; and this relation we feel to be capable of expansion until it embraces the whole of reality, in that 'mystical' union of moments of vision, when the personality, still retaining its indivdual existence, finds itself merged in eternity wth the *Absolute*. The final step in that exploration of the universe which began with '*Cogito, ergo sum*' is reached with '*Diligo te, Domine, ergo tu es*.'

Hallowed be Thy Name

To know God, then, is to revere and love Him; ultimately, to enter into complete union with Him. But how can this be attained? 'No man hath seen God at any time.'

I believe that those qualities which are generally regarded as possessing 'ultimate' value—Beauty, Truth and Goodness—are the means by which God reveals Himself to us; that Beauty is the stamp of the Divine in the material world, Truth in the intellectual world, Goodness in the moral world; and that, in recognising and revering them wherever they are found, we are hallowing God's name.

It is, of course, possible to explain the value that we attach to these qualities on evolutionary grounds. Our love of beauty may be derived from an instinctive recognition of fitness, of which human beauty as fitness for parenthood is perhaps the most obvious instance. Our love of truth may spring from the desire to master our environment through knowledge of its laws. Our love of goodness may arise from the sense that it makes ultimately for the welfare and happiness of the race. Doubtless, if man were so constituted as to pursue and admire qualities detrimental to his welfare, mankind would perish! But to seek the meaning of anything in its origin rather than its end is to turn the universe upside down, and ultimately to destroy meaning altogether. If truth is merely survival-value, all argument is vain.

Much, though not all, beauty seems to result from perfect adaptation to some vital function. We can trace this in the colour of a flower, in the shape of a tree, the form of a racehorse, the lines of a sailing ship or a cathedral. But in these cases the beauty

can be appreciated by those who have no insight into the laws that determine it. Beauty seems to be something added, a grace supervening on rightness, a revelation of the glory of the works of God and of man, the child of God. The tendency to banish the word from the discussion of aesthetics is a symptom of the chaos into which materialism leads. Banish God from the world of thought, and beauty, truth and goodness perish.

Truth is valued for its own sake, apart from any practical results which its attainment may bring us. The pursuit of truth is recognised as the noblest employment of man's intellectual powers. The universality of the laws which that pursuit reveals, and the correspondence between the order of the universe and the processes of thought, give us, no less than the beauty of the material world, an instinctive sense of the omnipresence of God.

But this sense of being in touch with the absolute and eternal is felt even more keenly in response to pure Goodness in human character; and we feel it most powerfully when Goodness brings not prosperity but misfortune and calamity. Here, surely, is the explanation of that exaltation which a great tragedy produces in our minds. Antigone goes to her death in obedience to 'the unwritten laws inviolable of heaven, which are not of to-day, nor yesterday,' and, despite the immediate pain and loss, we feel uplifted by a sense of the glory and grandeur of the world and of life. Beyond the mortal, we receive a glimpse of immortality.

If we are not blinded by ephemeral desires, we reverence Goodness, tried and proved by life, above all else; the Goodness of a Francis of Assisi, a Captain Oates, an Edith Cavell, which flowers in evil times, and may lift the private soldier or the mother from a bombed street to the level of the saints. There is, of course, a 'virtue' which is the fruit of high breeding, honourable tradition, and training in courage and courtesy; this we admire and value, but we do not reverence it, unless there is added that Goodness of spirit which makes its possessor ready to sacrifice all other gifts, and life itself, for the love of God or man. The supreme Goodness whose value is absolute must be the complete consecration of the self to a cause outside and beyond the self. It must be love in unimpeded action. When we behold this, as in the example of the Cross, we feel that we are in the presence of the divine.

Thy Kingdom Come; Thy Will be Done in Earth as it in in Heaven

Prayer is, in essence, the conversion of wish into will, the attempt to divert the will into what man believes to be the best

channel. It is a spur to action, not a substitute for it. 'Seek and ye shall find, knock and it shall be opened unto you,' are the natural sequels to 'Ask and ye shall receive.' The Lord's Prayer is more than a pattern for man's aspirations; it is a pattern for man's life. No man can use its words honestly without trying to translate them into deeds. Every clause carries with it practical implications.

'Seek ye first the Kingdom of God.' If we are indeed sons of God, sharing His nature and finding our true home in the heavenly realm of timeless reality, then our first aim must be to make this heavenly realm actual for us upon earth.

A false philosophy has taught us to seek the law of our being by looking downwards to the animal creation from which we have risen, instead of upwards to God. We have supposed that the general good would result from universal self-seeking, and our society is torn by the contest between sordid wealth and squalid poverty. We have based our dealings with other nations on the pursuit of national interests, and world-wide wars have ensued. It is only by putting the Kingdom of God first, and directing our wills to the accomplishment of His will, that we can shape our own lives, and the life of the world, according to the true pattern from which human welfare will flow.

Give Us this Day our Daily Bread

We are body and spirit; and the body's needs must be met. To live well, we must first be enabled to live. But every petition carries with it a duty. We have no right to ask God to satisfy our needs unless we are either working to produce things needful or repaying by our services those who do this for us. Nor can we with a good conscience ask Him to give us our daily bread unless we are doing what we can to ensure that none of His children starve while we or others enjoy a superfluity. If we are in earnest about the coming of God's kingdom on earth, we must so arrange our society that all who work may eat, and that none shall be prevented by material hardship from living the full life of a child of God. Rightly understood, this petition binds us to pursue, in private and public matters, the ideal of social justice for all mankind.

Forgive us our Trespasses, as We forgive them that Trespass against Us

The notion that Jesus came into the world primarily to save men from the everlasting punishment demanded by a vindictive

deity for their sins, or for the sin of Adam, is a dreadful travesty of Christianity. In the Gospels, Jesus is represented as saving men from their sins, a very different matter; as healing the disease, not merely curing the symptoms, and as setting the patient on the road to new life and health.

How can a perfect and changeless being be said to 'forgive' sins? The answer, no doubt, is that what we call forgiveness is, from God's point of view, reconciliation. Man becomes alienated from God through self-will; but when he 'comes to himself' he finds his father's relation to him unchanged. All that is needed is that he should be conscious of having done amiss and sincerely desirous of amendment. A sense of the need for 'forgiveness' is the first step towards a new life; but there is no trace in the Gospels of encouragement for that obsession with sin which makes the past a burden for the future. Where Jesus found people burdened with a sense of guilt, His first care seems to have been to relieve them from this oppression and set them free to live for the Kingdom.

The only conditions of forgiveness are that he should desire it, and that he should forgive others. This latter is a token that he has attained that state which makes forgiveness possible. He who bears a grudge against another cannot himself be fit for reconciliation. Those who are intent upon doing God's work will not stop to quarrel over personal wrongs. Our own sins, and our inability to forgive the sins of others, are the two main obstacles to the fulfilment of the prayer, 'Thy Kingdom come.' Both must be cleared away together by a change of heart.

And lead us not into Temptation, but deliver us from Evil

It would be impossible within the limits of this essay to discuss the problem of the permitted existence of evil. It may be that its reality is confined to this world of time and space. However that may be, we are bidden to pray to be spared temptation and delivered from evil; and here, too, the petition implies duties. First, we cannot ask not to be led into temptation if we are deliberately exposing ourselves to it; and, secondly, we cannot do so if we are placing temptation in the way of others. We cannot ask to be delivered from evil if by thoughtlessness or callousness we are inflicting evil. Our society is filled with incitements to self-indulgence, covetousness, dishonesty and other forms of wrong; it is never easy to draw the line between an intolerant puritanism and an easy-going acquiescence in low standards; but

here, too, the guiding rule must be 'Seek ye first the Kingdom of God.'

Other religions ignore evil, or passively accept it, or seek to explain it as illusion, or to avert it by magic rites. Christianity acknowledges its reality, in so far as our earthly life is concerned, but only to challenge it; seeks the solution of the poblem in action rather than in speculation, in creative life and love triumphing over death and hate; and, by adopting for its sign the image of suffering and shame, testifies that evil exists to be faced and overcome by good, till God's Kingdom shall come and His will be done in earth as it is in heaven.

In attempting to draw out the implications of the Lord's Prayer, I have omitted all discussion of Christ's Person, and of the theories put forward by the Churches to explain Him. 'Who do men say that I am?' He asked; and the answer came, 'Some say, John the Baptist, and some Elias.' Always when we are confronted with a great new character we tend to fall back on precedents to account for him; Napoleon becomes a second Caesar, as Caesar a second Alexander. When John sent and asked, 'Art thou he that should come?' Jesus gave no direct reply; He bade the messengers report what they had seen and heard, and added, 'Blessed is he that shall not be offended in me'—*i.e.* blessed is he who is not disappointed by my refusal to fall in with his preconceptions. All attempts to explain the life and teaching of Jesus have been influenced by the ideas current in His lifetime and later; by the notion of propitiatory sacrifice, by the visionary hopes of apocalyptic writers, by the mystery religions of the Hellenic world, by Gnosticism and Neoplatonism and other speculations. The dogmatic husk of Christianity has changed from age to age; even where it has remained formally the same, the emphasis has shifted; yet the Church has preserved the teaching of its Founder, and that teaching has continued to appeal to men's hearts and minds, and to their intuitions about their own nature, as it did when it was first uttered. The essence of that teaching is, I believe, enshrined in the prayer which He gave to His first disciples. If Christians everywhere who accept that teaching and repeat that prayer could agree to make it the basis for a practical union, in a common effort to transform the world, I believe that such an enterprise would win the adhesion of many who are at present outside the organized Churches, and might wield influence throughout mankind which would speed the coming of the Kingdom that all Christians alike desire.

R. Kennard Davis

TENNYSON'S RELIGION

By J. C. Hardwick

THE religious beliefs of any individual can only be examined in connection with his life as a whole and not in isolation from it; for the beliefs themselves are a part of that life, and take their colour from its conditions, spiritual, mental and physical.

Alfred Tennyson was a precocious child, the son of a gifted and erudite father whose life had been spoiled by a sense of grievance which he could never overcome. Like Esau he had been supplanted by his younger brother and put into a profession which was uncongenial, and this rankled. Sir Charles Tennyson, in his recent Life of his Grandfather,[1] reveals in ample detail the sombre state of affairs that existed in Somersby Rectory, with the gloomy father, the pious and patient mother, and the horde of eleven children 'wandering about wold and marsh at all hours of the day and night, hatless and often coatless, with their noses in books or absorbed in argument or declamation.'

> 'I have known some satisfaction in thinking that my boys will turn out to be clever men,' wrote Dr. George Tennyson to his brother Charles. 'Phoenix-like, I trust (though I don't think myself a Phoenix) they will spring up from my ashes, in consequence of the exertions I have bestowed upon them.'

At any rate he worked hard in trying to educate them; young Alfred could repeat most of the Odes of Horace at the age of seven; but they were also the kind of children who can educate themselves. They composed poems and plays, made up serials and ghost stories, Alfred being the most adept in the work. Their father's varied and comprehensive library was a source of instruction and entertainment which never failed.

When ten or eleven Alfred wrote hundreds of lines in the style of Pope, and at the same time fell under the spell of Scott and composed an epic of six thousand lines in the style of *Marmion*. Later came a Miltonic phase, which took shape in a remarkable poem *Armageddon*, dating probably from his fifteenth year. At about the same time he wrote two plays in blank verse. The one which survives — *The Devil and the Lady* — shows an intimate knowledge of the Elizabethan dramatists, Beaumont and Fletcher as well as Shakespeare.

The Miltonic poem contains some lines which suggest that the lad had been the subject of the mystical experience which is

[1] *Alfred Tennyson.* By Sir Charles Tennyson. (Macmillan. 1949. 30/.)

perhaps more common among the young than is supposed, though not many have the power to describe it:

> 'I wondered with deep wonder at myself.
> . . . All sense of Time
> And Being and Place was swallowed up and lost
> Within a victory of boundless thought.
> I was a part of the Unchangeable,
> A scintillation of Eternal Mind.'

The Devil and the Lady is not only the work of a lively and inventive imagination,[2] but contains lines, put into the mouth of the Devil, which echo the speculations of the philosophic Bishop Berkeley:

> 'O suns and spheres and stars and belts and systems,
> Are ye or are ye not?
> Are ye realities or semblances
> Of that which men call real?
> Are ye true substances? Are ye anything
> Except delusive shows?
> I have some doubt if ye exist when none
> Are by to view ye.'

This combination of mysticism and metaphysical interest was to be characteristic of Tennyson throughout his life.

Somersby Rectory may not have been an ideal environment in some respects for an adolescent boy, for the nerve strain involved by his father's queer temperament was excessive. But at least the lad was allowed to follow his own bent, and to feed his mind and practise his literary experiments to the full. The consequence was that when Alfred went up to Trinity, Cambridge, with his brother Charles in 1827, he was ripe to take full advantage of the intellectual life of the place which was lively and fertile with new ideas. Prophets like Rousseau, Godwin, Wordsworth, Byron, Shelley had cast their bread upon the waters, and it was bearing fruit in a general effervescence of thought. Men of science too like Priestley, Davy, Dalton and others were opening up new vistas. Men like Connop Thirlwall and Julius Hare — both Fellows of Trinity — were acquainted with the latest results of German scholarship. Idealists like F. D. Maurice had exercised a strong influence at Cambridge, and Maurice in particular had been instrumental in initiating a society for intellectual debate, known to the profane as 'The Apostles.'

[2] It tells the story of a magician, Magus, who, being called away on some mystic errand, summons up the Devil and entrusts him with the task of looking after his young wife, Amoret, in his absence. The Devil packs Amoret off to bed, disguises himself in her clothes, and then admits her lovers to Magus's cottage, where he diverts himself with them till Magus returns. Unfortunately the play ends here, unfinished.

Whatever the shortcomings of Somersby, Alfred loved his home.

> 'What shall sever me
> From the love of home?'

were the opening lines of a poem he wrote at this time but which was not published till after his death. The sudden transition to Cambridge, where he knew no one but his elder brother Frederick who had been up a year, must have been disturbing if not distressing to this sensitive youth who had hardly been twenty miles away from home in his life. The first time he and Charles went into Hall for dinner 'they could not face the noise, the lights and the lines of strange faces, and turned back in panic to their lodgings.' Yet the two freshmen were known as the brothers of Frederick Tennyson, 'the brilliant and turbulent Etonian' who had won the Browne medal for a Greek ode on the Pyramids. Also, it was known that the three brothers had already published a volume of verse.

The mere physical appearance of Alfred sufficed to attract interested attention. 'Over six feet tall, of powerful build; head magnificently set upon his broad shoulders; strong aquiline features; a mass of fine black hair; olive-dark skin; deep-lidded brown eyes, which had at once the dim look of extreme short sight and a concentrated gaze as of one who sees far into the distance.' He seemed entirely unconscious of the impressiveness of his appearance; was untidy if not slovenly in his dress, and smoked strong tobacco in a clay pipe — a habit of his since the age of fourteen.

He was shy by nature and at first felt miserably isolated; but this phase did not last long. His shyness could not conceal the power and vitality of his personality, and no rusticity could hide his profound idealism and sensitiveness. His mind was bound to make contact with the minds of others. He now seemed 'to have stepped out of the twilight of the past into the glare and bustle of a tumultuous present. Horizons opened to him, so vast that he was filled with a new kind of exultation, an intense desire "to follow knowledge like a sinking star beyond the utmost bounds of human thought".' He expressed his feeling, as usual, in verse:

> 'Would I could pile fresh life on life and dull
> The sharp desire of knowledge still with knowing.
> Art, Science, Nature, everything is full
> As my own soul is full to overflowing.'

At the beginning of Alfred Tennyson's second year at Cambridge the man came up to Trinity whom he was to immortalise

in the poem which made his name. Arthur Hallam, son of one of the leading historical and literary scholars of the day, a man of wealth and wide interests, was two years Tennyson's junior and had already shown signs of extraordinary gifts and talents.[3] These two young men found in one another the friend they were looking for, to whom the most intimate ideals and beliefs could be confided. Both were elected members of 'The Apostles' where all things in heaven and earth were discussed with uninhibited enthusiasm. The Society then 'contained a membership more remarkable than at any other time in its history,' including Trench (afterwards Archbishop of Dublin), John Kemble, Monckton Milnes, Edmund Lushington (afterwards Professor of Greek at Glasgow), W. H. Thompson, afterwards Master of Trinity.

This plunge into human society — and society of this quality, was of inestimable value to Tennyson, giving him confidence and stimulating his mind and his imagination. Metaphysical or religious discussion fascinated him. It would appear that, from a study of Cuvier's researches he had already arrived at some apprehension of the theory of evolution, nearly thirty years before the appearance of *The Origin of Species*.

The bond between Alfred Tennyson and Arthur Hallam was strengthened by Arthur falling in love with Tennyson's sister Emily, and though Arthur's father did not at first approve of the affair, he accepted the situation, but made it a condition that the young man should not see or correspond with Emily again until after his twenty-first birthday. But in due course the pair were officially engaged.

Dr. Tennyson who had been in failing health for some time, the root causes of his illness having been clearly psychological rather than physical, died in 1831, when Alfred was only 22. The task of disposing of the numerous family, whom fortunate circumstances permitted to continue in occupation of the Rectory, fell upon the grandfather, Mr. George Tennyson, a formidable character of the old style. He did not think a great deal of the Somersby grandchildren — 'idle, untidy and erratic.' They did not look like earning a decent living, still less of making a mark in the world. The young men at Cambridge had run into debt, as had their father at home, which was distressing to the old man's frugal spirit. He had little opinion of young Alfred's poetical exploits; thought the stuff incomprehensible and unlikely to find

[3] At fifteen he was elected member of the Eton Society of which his great friend W. E. Gladstone was a member. In this society the boys discussed with enthusiasm all manner of questions, social, historical, political, literary.

market. His idea was to put the young man into the Church, as livings were available.

But Alfred had no wish to follow in his father's footsteps though the need to make some money was painfully evident. Some favourable notices of what he had already published, and the support and encouragement of Arthur Hallam, who with his family connections could exercise some influence with publishers and reviewers, encouraged him to issue, in 1832, a further collection of his work — *Poems by Alfred Tennyson*, which included *Oenone*, *The Lotus-Eaters*, and *The Palace of Art*. This last poem in particular is important as an indication of the position the poet now occupied. It is said to have originated from a discussion with Trench who had said to him, 'Alfred, we cannot live by Art.' The poem's aim was,

> 'to represent allegorically the condition of a mind which, in the love of beauty and consciousness of intellectual power, has lost sight of its relation to man and to God.'

In *Oenone* the attempt is made to infuse some modern feeling into the old classical legends. Pallas Athene becomes the mouthpiece of the poet's philosophy and the Victorian ethic:

> 'Self-reverence, self-knowledge, self-control,
> These three alone lead life to sovereign power.'

And,

> 'to live by law,
> Acting the law we live by without fear.'

The poems were unfortunate in their reception, and 'for almost a decade the tone of public reference to Tennyson was one either of disparagement or ridicule.'

In the year following (1833), Arthur Hallam's engagement to Emily Tennyson was recognized by his family, the young man spending some part of the summer at Somersby, weeks which Alfred was to remember with regret for the rest of his life, for this foretaste of happiness was shorn of fulfilment. Arthur and his father went abroad that August, and on September 15th Henry Hallam came back to his hotel in Vienna to discover his son dead in an armchair. To both Alfred and his sister the blow was overwhelming.

> 'During the first months of his sorrow,' writes Sir Charles Tennyson, 'waves of depression swept over him, so dark that he often longed for death. The sudden extinction of his friend, with all his infinite capacity for affection and his brilliant promise, struck at the very roots of his will to live. Could it really be that all this great spiritual treasure was annihilated: that all human love and all man's spiritual effort are but a momentary ripple on the ocean of eternity? Was the world wholly without purpose and man an irresponsible toy for the gigantic forces of Nature? If so, what value could there be in life?'

Such were the problems that the poet now set himself to solve. The poem, *The Two Voices*, describes the mood through which the poet struggled during the months that followed Arthur Hallam's death. The long debate closes on a note of tranquillity:

'On to God's house the people prest:
Passing the place where each must rest,
Each entered like a welcome guest.

'One walked between his wife and child,
With measured footfall firm and mild,
And now and then he gravely smiled.

. . . .

'These three made unity so sweet,
My frozen heart began to beat,
Remembering its ancient heat.

'I blest them, and they wandered on:
I spoke, but answer came there none:
The dull and bitter voice was gone.'

This may not seem deep philosophy. But it was a return to life and to simplicity — the way of healing. *Ulysses*, too, voices the feeling of the poet that one must not sit and grieve, but accept life and its experiences, sweet or bitter, and launch out into the unknown.

'I cannot rest from travel: I will drink
Life to the lees: all times I have enjoy'd
Greatly, have suffer'd greatly, both with those
That love me, and alone . . .
I am a part of all that I have met;
Yet all experience is an arch wherethro'
Gleams that untravell'd world, whose margin fades
For ever and for ever as I move.
How dull it is to pause, to make an end,
To rust unburnished, not to shine in use!
As tho' to breathe were life.'

But the poem in which Alfred Tennyson, so to speak, made up his accounts with the universe and reached some conclusion as to what interpretation to place upon the death of his friend Arthur Hallam, was the product of many years' thought and labour, and did not appear until 1850, seventeen years after Hallam's death, and then it was published anonymously and with no indication as to who was the 'A.H.H.' mentioned in the sub-title.

In considering *In Memoriam* — the poem with which Tennyson made his name — note must be taken of the general state of educated opinion in religious matters a century ago. On the one hand, the general public may be said to have broken with traditional religious ideas far less than is the case to-day; but, on the other hand, the development of the natural sciences, more

especially astronomy and geology, by upsetting the biblical cosmology, had exercised a disturbing effect. As both time and space had been extended to infinity, so mankind had appeared to be an infinitesimal by-product of a cosmic process indifferent to him. The universe was not concerned with the aspirations or values of the human species; it was not designed to meet our special requirements.

At the same time religious instincts and habits still remained strong, and the majority of men were anxious for some firm and settled religious beliefs; for the most part they were not, as so many are to-day, merely indifferent and contentedly agnostic. Religious doubt was still painful to those who experienced it, and people did long for a solution to their difficulties which should not ignore the new scientific knowledge, but should make a sincere attempt to bring that knowledge and religious faith into harmony.

In Memoriam had many strong points which made it effective. In the first place it was a *poem*, and there is much to be said for casting religious or philosophic argument into the poetic form. Lucretius understood this when he wrote his *De Rerum Natura*. The finest and most spiritually exalted portions of the Hebrew Scriptures are poetry; and the same remark applies to the sacred writings of the East. The fact seems to be that plain prose has not the power to express the highest imaginings and deepest insights of mankind.

The second point that recommended the poem to the thoughtful public was its obvious *sincerity*. The poet had no axe to grind, dogmatic or ecclesiastical; he was obviously striving to get at the truth, and he gave the impression of intellectual honesty. There were no tricks here, no clevernesses, no paradoxes and verbal squibs. Here was a soul who had 'been through it,' who knew what it was to lose a loved friend, to feel that something had gone out of life that nothing could ever replace. And yet a soul that would never be content *not* to know, if knowledge was to be had.

The third point follows from this, namely the *humanity* of the poem, and none of the critics, however respectful, realized how strong this appeal would prove to be.

> 'The message of love and hope was reinforced with so many touches of exquisite pathos—the mother praying with bowed head for the safety of her sailor son . . . The widower seeing in sleep the vision of a late-lost form and moving his doubtful arms, only to feel that her place is empty . . . the poignant stanzas in which the poet imagines the passage of the ship, bringing Arthur's body from Italy; those describing the summer days and nights in the Rectory garden and the poet's farewell to his old home.

The almost complete absence of metaphysical speculation in the poem was no disadvantage in the eyes of its readers. It was a result of the poet's failure to find any rigidly logical basis for his intuitions. 'He was not interested in speculation but in proof, and, failing proof, he had to fall back on faith, and this faith, even at the end of the struggle, he can only pronounce doubtfully and fearfully, like a child, but like a child which "crying knows his father near."'

The conclusions reached might seem, to those accustomed to revelationist dogma, vague and tentative. But coming as they clearly did from one who had himself been the victim of doubt and despair and had struggled through to something positive, they had a value essentially different from any assured pronouncements of professional religionists.

> 'Thou wilt not leave us in the dust:
> Thou madest man, he knows not why,
> He thinks he was not made to die;
> And thou hast made him: thou art just.'

Less than a fortnight after the publication of *In Memoriam* Tennyson married Emily Sellwood, and what with marriage and the success of the poem a new and happier life opened out for the poet.[4] Five weeks before the publication, Wordsworth, the Poet Laureate, had died. Amongst the admirers of *In Memoriam* was the Prince Consort, and the Laureateship was offered to and accepted by Tennyson.

Though their first child was still-born, a second, a son, was born in August, 1852. He was called Hallam, and when the christening took place Arthur's father was one godfather and F. D. Maurice the other. Maurice was then at the height of his controversy with the authorities of King's College, in which he had the poet's sympathy.

> 'Should all our churchmen foam in spite
> At you, so careful of the right,
> Yet one lay heart would give you welcome
> (Take it and come) to the Isle of Wight.'

The reference of course, is to Farringford, near Freshwater, which the Tennysons rented in 1853 and afterwards bought. A house most charmingly situated, and to which many visitors came, amongst them Fitzgerald, A. H. Clough, Jowett. Under the influence of the last, the poet began to study metaphysics—Spinoza, Berkeley, Kant. Indeed, for forty years Jowett was a welcome Christmas guest. One remark of his would be congenial

[4] 'The peace of God entered my life when I married her,' were his words.

Alfred: 'Poetry may solve the riddle of the Universe. Philosophy and science never can.'

Jowett, of course, in a few years' time came under heavy fire on account of his contribution to *Essays and Reviews*. He had consented to co-operate in the volume as being a deliberate challenge to

> 'the abominable system of terrorism which prevents the statement of the plainest fact and makes true theology or theological education impossible.'

He could count on, and received, the support of Tennyson. 'I cannot but express to you what I feel,' he wrote, 'especially in all this tumult, that it is the greatest blessing and good for me to have friends like you, who are so true and affectionate to me.'

One of the products of Tennyson's increased interest in metaphysics, fostered by Jowett, was the poem *The Higher Pantheism*. Here the idea, hinted at in *In Memoriam*, that the material universe may be the vision of God, though man's limitations prevent him perceiving the reality, finds expression:

> 'The sun, the moon, the stars, the seas, the hills and the plains,
> Are not these, O Soul, the Vision of Him who reigns?
> And the ear of man cannot hear, and the eye of man cannot see;
> But if we could see and hear, this Vision—were it not He?'

Another philosophical poem of this period is *Wages*. Here it is proclaimed that 'unless the spiritual essence and achievement of man endures after physical death, life can be nothing but a brutal waste and mockery.'

> 'The wages of sin is death: if the wages of Virtue be dust,
> Would she have heart to endure for the life of the worm and the fly?
> She desires no isles of the blest, no quiet seats of the just.
> Give her the wages of going on, and not to die.'

The lines in the former of these two poems,

> 'Speak to Him thou for he hears, and Spirit with Spirit can meet—
> Closer is he than breathing, and nearer than hands and feet.'

show that for Tennyson God was no metaphysical abstraction but the God of religion and of the mystic, one to whom prayer might be addressed with the certainty of its being heard. Witness the famous passage in *The Passing of Arthur*:

> 'I have lived my life, and that which I have done
> May He within himself make pure! but thou,
> If thou shouldst never see my face again,
> Pray for my soul. More things are wrought by prayer
> Than this world dreams of. Wherefore, let thy voice
> Rise like a fountain for me night and day.
> For what are men better than sheep or goats
> That nourish a blind life within the brain,
> If, knowing God, they lift not hands of prayer

Both for themselves and those who call them friend?
For so the whole round earth is every way
Bound by gold chains about the feet of God.
But now farewell. I am going a long way . . .'

Tennyson's religious faith certainly depended upon experience, though experience, too, is of course the fruit of faith. The two, as it were, support and strengthen and enrich one another. He could express what he believed and felt with directness and simplicity. 'God is walking with us now, on this Down, as we two are walking together, just as truly as Christ was with the two disciples on the way to Emmaus,' he said once to his niece, Agnes Weld. 'To feel that He is by my side now as much as you are, that is the very joy of my heart.'

The Victorians were, in general, optimists; and no doubt felt that they had good reason to be, since the age was one of expansion in more senses than one. But Tennyson, perhaps by temperament, found optimism difficult. There were times, says his latest biographer, when a natural tendency to gloom and despondency reasserted itself, 'and he became more and more oppressed with doubts about the usefulness of his own work and the future of humanity.' 'You must not be surprised at anything which comes to pass in the next fifty years,' he wrote.

Late in 1886 appeared a poem which gave expression to this sombre outlook — *Sixty Years After*, a sequel to *Locksley Hall*. In this the hero of the earlier poem, now a man of eighty, looks back on the past and sees the vanity of his passionate strivings and the disappointment of hopes.

'Gone the fires of youth, the follies, furies, curses, passionate tears,
Fires that shook me once, but now to silent ashes fall'n away.
Cold upon the dead volcano sleeps the gleam of dying day.
Gone the comrades of my bivouac, some in fight against the foe,
Some thro' age and slow diseases, gone as all on earth will go.
Gone with whom for forty years my life in golden sequence ran,
She with all the charm of woman, she with all the breadth of man.
Very woman of very woman, nurse of ailing body and mind,
She that link'd again the broken chain that bound me to my kind.'

Tennyson by this time had lost friends, as all must who grow older. A death which he felt deeply was that of Sir John Simeon, squire of Swainston in the Isle of Wight. Sir John was a fine type of country gentleman — a good scholar, a good landlord, 'cultivated, humorous, simple and sincere.'

'The loss of his friend hung over him like a cloud throughout the summer. 'He was the only man on earth, I verily believe,' so he wrote to Lady Simeon, 'to whom I could, and have more than once opened my whole heart, and he also has given me, in many a conversation, his utter confidence. I knew none like him for tenderness and generosity.'

Another deeply felt death was that of W. G. Ward, a very close friend whom he lost some ten years later. Edward Fitzgerald, too, 'perhaps the dearest of his old friends,' died suddenly in 1883. Dean Stanley, another old friend, had died a year or so before. And in 1886, when he was now 77, the poet suffered the loss of his second son Lionel, who died on his way home from India.

The poem *Sixty Years After* caused something of a stir in Liberal circles, and Mr. Gladstone took up the challenge in *The Nineteenth Century* in an 'elaborately deferential' article. It was felt, perhaps, that with the Jubilee of 1887 impending, pessimism was out of place. But it was not, in the case of Tennyson, due, as some of his friends suggested by way of excuse, to subjective causes, but rather to a realization by the poet that materialism and the wide rejection of religious belief do not confine themselves to the realm of theory only, but have practical results also. Though clinging obstinately to his faith in man's ultimate future, he felt misgivings:

> 'The growing materialism of the age, the weakening of spiritual and moral values, combined with the rapid increase in man's control over nature and the means of destruction, seemed every year more ominous.'

What it amounted to was that Tennyson saw rather deeper into things than the secular Liberals, or even possibly than Mr. Gladstone himself. After all, a poet or prophet without a tinge of pessimism about the world around him would surely be shallow and superficial. There are some who, having reluctantly abandoned religious faith, see only too clearly that all optimism about human life is a shallow mockery. Of such was Thomas Hardy, and the author of *Ecclesiastes*. Tennyson may have had little interest in 'the forms of faith,' but he held the two fundamental beliefs — belief in God and in immortality. He dared not, says Sir Charles Tennyson, formulate a more precise creed than that 'there is something that watches over us and our personality endures.' Precise definitions perhaps do more harm than good. It was his faith that Arthur Hallam lived. But how? To some his answer to this question may seem vague; to others, satisfying:

> Thy voice is on the rolling air;
> I hear thee where the waters run;
> Thou standest in the rising sun,
> And in the setting thou art fair.
>
> Far off thou art, but ever nigh;
> I have thee still, and I rejoice;
> I prosper, circled with thy voice;
> I shall not lose thee tho' I die.

Or again:

> Dear friend, far off, my lost desire,
> So far, so near in woe and weal;
> O loved the most, when most I feel
> There is a lower and a higher;
>
> Known and unknown; human, divine;
> Sweet human hand and lips and eye;
> Dear heavenly friend that canst not die,
> Mine, mine, for ever, ever mine.

It is fitting that Tennyson's most famous lyric should express the faith which for him was fundamental. *Crossing the Bar* came to him 'almost in a flash' as he was crossing the Solent from Lymington to Yarmouth. 'He unfolded a used envelope and jotted the sixteen short lines roughly down on the inside of it.' He recited the lines that evening to Nurse Durham. 'The lines came as a great shock to her, for it seemed to her that he had written his own death song.' He was eighty, but in fact had another three years to live. After dinner that night he showed the poem to his son Hallam. 'That is the crown of your life's work,' was his comment. 'It came in a moment,' replied the old man.

It may well be that some have abandoned the idea of survival after death as a reaction against the doctrine of eternal punishment, so dear then to the hearts of the orthodox devout.[5] The poet's father, however, was stoutly opposed to the doctrine and would never read the Athanasian Creed. The poet, too, detested the doctrine, and gave his strong support to F. D. Maurice when he was driven from his professorship at King's College, London, by the University authorities because he refused to accept the orthodox view as to eternal punishment. The warm and friendly poem 'To the Rev. F. D. Maurice' has already been quoted:

> 'Till you should turn to dearer matters,
> Dear to the man that is dear to God:
> How best to help the slender store,
> How mend the dwellings of the poor;
> How gain in life, as life advances,
> Valour and charity more and more.'

Tennyson resented the bitter persecution of men like Jowett and Maurice by the bigots of the established Church. These men

[5] Alfred in after years would repeat with grim amusement some of the sayings of his Calvinistic Aunt Mary, wife of a Lincolnshire squire. 'She would weep with emotion at the infinite goodness of God. "Has he not," she would exclaim, "damned most of my friends? But *me, me* he has picked out for eternal salvation, me who am no better than my neighbours!" It seemed that she included Alfred among the goats. "Alfred, Alfred," she said to him one day, "when I look at you I think of the words of Holy Scripture, *Depart from me ye cursed into everlasting fire.*"'

did not follow the advice the Lincolnshire churchwarden gave to the curate :

> But Parson 'e *will* speak out, saw, now 'e be sixty-seven,
> He'll niver swap Owlby an' Scratby fur owt but the Kingdom o' Heaven ;
> An' thou'll be 'is Curate 'ere, but, if ever tha means to git 'igher,
> Tha mun tackle the sins o' the Wo'ld, an' not the faults o' the Squire.
> If tha cottons down to thy betters, an' keeps thysen to thysen.
> But niver not speak plaain out, if tha wants to git forrads a bit,
> But creeap along the hedge-bottoms, an' thou'll be a Bishop yet.

It is no depreciation of Tennyson to say that he was a product of his time, for it is equally true to say that his was one of the formative influences that helped to mould the general attitude of the period. He could not have done this had he not been *of* the time in which he lived, alive to all the influences which prevailed and affected and inspired by them. At the same time, as we have noted, he did not see eye to eye with the unrestrained optimists of the period, foreseeing with vague misgivings tendencies and results which since his day have had time to display themselves in ways which would have horrified his contemporaries.

Of course in our day the Christian, or even the religious, apologist has to face problems which had not arisen in Tennyson's time. The New Geology and the New Biology presented him with difficulties which he strove to solve, but the New Psychology lay in the future, and the sciences of anthropology and comparative religion had not brought their batteries into position. Each generation, however, has to solve its own problems, and, as Höffding says, ' Every solution of a problem presents a fresh problem.'

Probably Tennyson will be longest remembered for his poem of immortality — *In Memoriam*. The poem is long — far too long to suit modern tastes and modern impatience, nor is it convincing to any who desire to pick holes in its logic. Indeed, its appeal does not depend on its logic; its logic is that of the heart, its appeal is to the affections. And it was F. H. Bradley, surely no sentimentalist, who wrote that this general appeal to the affections was the only appeal as to a future life which to him individually was not hollow.

METAPHYSICS: A NEW APPROACH*

THE English are supposed to take their revolutions quietly, indeed, hardly to notice them until they have become accomplished facts. Perhaps that is the reason why a recent book by J. V. Langmead Casserley has attracted so little attention. A talk on the wireless, a review in *Philosophy*, that is the extent of the interest the philosophical world appears to have shown in the most original philosophical work of recent years, one which is nothing less than the ground-plan for a new logic and a new metaphysic.

Briefly, the writer's thesis is that metaphysics, if it is to regain its once honoured place in the world of thought, must abandon the old ways of thinking in terms of the universal and the particular and learn to think in terms of the 'singular' or 'unique.' That is, we must cease to try to understand individuals as particular instances of a universal, or class. Definition by *genus* and *differentia* is inadequate, because in any individual we are confronted with a 'this,' a 'hecceity,' something (Mr. Casserley does not use this illustration but I cannot think it inappropriate) in the nature of a *Gestalt*, or whole, a positive, individual, unique being, with a plus of content, qualification and value unlike any other. Possibly the term 'individual' with its suggestion of indivisibility, of a property impervious to analysis, would better express this concept, but Mr. Casserley has chosen the word 'singular' and we must abide by his choice. Kierkegaard's term for it was 'the exceptional.' It signifies the unique. If we can understand what is meant by the theological term 'a soul to be saved' we shall, I think, have arrived at the essence of Mr. Casserley's concept of the singular.

If we agree to make this the basis of our understanding of men and things, we are at once brought up against the semantic problem. In what way are we going to communicate our knowledge of the singular? Try to define the essential nature of something whose essence consists in being unlike anything else and you are soon likely to find yourself up against a pretty stiff problem. Mr. Casserley's contention is that it is only by means of analogy that this can be done. Metaphysics should give up trying to be a demonstrative science and frankly recognise itself to be an analogical art. This is, in fact, what it has always been, even when its exponents most firmly believed otherwise. 'What the rationalist metaphysicians were really doing was to interpret reality by

* The Christian in Philosophy, by J. V. Langmead Casserley. (Faber & Faber, 1949; 18s.)

nalogy with the systems of order they found in the realms of nathematics and logic.'[1] Indeed, the language used by Descartes n the *Discourse on Method*, where he describes his principles of easoning, definitely suggests analogy.

We are not, of course, alluding to the analogy of the modern ogician stating that if A is qualified by X, Y and Z, and B is ualified by X and Y, therefore B is probably qualified by Z also. t is the analogy which takes the form 'A is to B, what C is to D' vhich we have in mind. We might take as an example 'The .G.P.U. is to Russia what the Gestapo was to Germany,' or, to lunge straightway into the perilous waters of metaphysics, we ould use the method to suggest that complexity in a personality r a society, so far from being a fault, is a sign of a healthy aturity. Most organisms tend to become complex with the assage of time. Where is there greater complexity, and also eauty and healthy normality, than in an ancient oak, its great ole dividing and subdividing into a multitude of branches and oughs, until the eye is lost in the haze of twigs that finish the opmost boughs? The tree is, indeed, a living analogy of the multiplicity of forms we know as genera and species, into which biological life has been moulded as though by some invisible hand.

Analogy, Mr. Casserley holds, is rooted in the 'way of paradox.' To express the nature of singular being, the subject, also a singular, is driven to use paradox, which is expression of a contradiction. This is more than opposition, which is an element in most forms of art and is usually resolved into synthesis. True paradox is inescapable and we have to make the best of it. It is our last effort to express the inexpressible, that ultimate *something* we discover in the most significant human experiences. The present writer could only describe the music of Beethoven at its best as supremely original and supremely obvious, a paradoxical expression involving contradiction.

This method of approach is put forward as an alternative, not only to definition by genus and differentia, as prescribed by the classical logic, but also to the doctrine of logical positivism, which, with the pessimism so typical of the modern mind, regards metaphysics as a hopeless business altogether and would like to restrict the rôle of philosophy to the elucidation of 'meanings,' using a new scientific phraseology for the purpose. A 'meaning' is likely to prove an even tougher customer than a fact when it comes to pinning it down, like a butterfly on a card.

If to explain reality is to express and interpret all the relevant

[1] *op. cit.*

facts of human experience, a context far larger than that in which the scientist lives and moves and has his being is required. Only the immeasurable experiences of the philosopher, the aesthete and the mystic can provide this context and for their expression only the way of the poet and the theologian, the way of drama and paradox, seems to be adequate.

It will be seen from the above short sketch that in the doctrine of singularity Mr. Casserley has seized upon and emphasized the one common element in the teaching of philosophers alike claiming the title of 'existentialists.' The late Professor Berdyaev is said to have exclaimed, 'L'existentialisme? C'est moi.' It seems, however, to be generally admitted that Kierkegaard was its earliest and most typical representative and that M. Sartre is its most distinguished living exponent. The essentials of a philosophy to which the religionist Kierkegaard and the atheist Sartre can both be supposed to adhere must be obscure indeed. Mr. Casserley's work gives body and emphasis to this essential element, the doctrine of the singular or 'personalist' nature of reality, the stress on the worth and significance of the individual, whose nature and value cannot be expressed by his relation to other things, especially to man-made abstraction such as the State, but resides in himself alone.

History and the study of history occupies a very large part, it might be true to say the largest part, in Mr. Casserley's thought. He even refers to history and metaphysics as though they were one and the same thing. History, he holds, is a study of the singular, as is metaphysics. It does not deal with universals and cannot be forced into a framework of Aristotelian logic, nor does it use the methods of natural science. Like any psychology worthy of the name, it is an attempt to understand men and the doings of men from within, by the light of our personal consciousness. The way of analogy is the way for the historian as for the metaphysician, 'analogies between persons and periods and even between a person and his own period. It is by analogy alone that singulars can validly be grouped and drawn together in the thought of the historian.'[2]

Mr. Casserley exposes, with simple and merciless logic, the inconsistencies of a thorough-going historical relativism. Although he refers to Collingwood as 'surely the greatest philosopher since Bradley,' he is critical of his doctrine upon important points. Curiously enough, he appears sceptical as to the emergence of a fully-fledged philosophy of history, although it is difficult to know

[2] *op. cit.*

ow else to refer to much of his own work. Take the following assage :

> 'An authentic and fruitful historicism will begin by preoccupying itself with the epistemological problems of the historical method, with an analysis of the meaning of a science and logic of the singular, and go on from there to evolve a new approach to the ultimate problems of metaphysics.'

What else is that but an anticipation of a thorough-going philoophy of history?

Mr. Casserley touches upon a subject which is relevant to all inds of enquiry that can be undertaken by the human mind, the uestion of impartial thinking. While deprecating, as any serious istorian must, 'blind partiality,' such as that shown in the ediaeval lives of the saints, he concedes 'a grain of truth' to ne assertion that 'history is best written from the standpoint of ne devotee.' The sympathy and insight necessary for good hisorical writing is impossible without something in the nature of artiality, but this has to be tempered by justice which supplies ne necessary objectivity for a balanced presentation of the facts. Here, perhaps, we can see the law of paradox at work.

I have tried to give some indication of the 'design for thinkng' put forward in Mr. Casserley's book and have deliberately mitted any mention of the foundation upon which it is built. Mr. Casserley, who is Rector of Mamhead, near Exeter, and also ecturer in Sociology at University College, Exeter, has written is book in the deep conviction that the early Christian philoophers, by reason of their preoccupation with God, not as a conept or an idea, but as a given fact of experience, arrived at a ethod of thinking, the twin ways of affirmation and negation, ater transformed by St. Thomas Aquinas into the way of analogy, hich has vast and hitherto undreamed-of potentialities for the olution of our present-day philosophical problems. It is not a uestion of 'Christianizing' philosophy, an idea which ought to e regarded as preposterous as Christianizing mathematics or eology. It is a question of examining the light which Christian hinkers, by reason of their special experience, can throw upon the roblems with which philosophy deals.

The book contains a great deal that I have not touched upon n this short survey. There is a short account of Western philoophical thought from the time of Augustine to the present day. The ontological argument is given an interpretation which, so far s the present writer knows, has never been suggested before and hich seems for the first time to make the argument into one to be

reckoned with. Existentialism is carefully examined and a great deal of attention is devoted to Kierkegaard and to the Bible in its historical aspect and as a vehicle of revelation.

Theological questions, in so far as they are distinct from metaphysical, are not referred to, and it would be interesting to know if the way of analogy is applicable to these also. Were theology established as an analogical art, were its truths admitted to be, not factual like the truths of physical science, but symbolical and in the nature of poetry and drama, theology might come to occupy a more important place in the world of thought than it does in fact hold to-day. It may be that theologians have always known that their creeds are but approximations to truth beyond the power of the human mind to express. Here, if anywhere, the semantic problem must surely be at its most acute. But the average man, if he thinks at all about such matters, imagines that the Church claims to speak the same language as science, that a clause in the Athanasian Creed uses the same categories of thought as the Second Law of Thermodynamics. If anyone doubts this assertion let him read some of the publications of the Rationalist Press Association. What wonder, then, that in a scientific age religion is loosing its hold? This, however, is a digression, inspired by speculation as to the possibilities of the art of analogy as a means of expression.

There is something reminiscent of the writings of the late Professor Berdyaev in Mr. Casserley's thought, though it is not easy to say in what the resemblance consists. Although there is far greater philosophical depths and penetration in the English clergyman than in the exiled Russian professor, there is the same cultured humanism, the same liberal outlook and the same critical faculty coupled with deep human sympathies, and the same atmosphere of intense religious conviction.

In conclusion, it only remains to say that Mr. Casserley's book is a joy to read, affording as it does an opportunity for the philosopher to get his teeth, if I may use such an analogy, into something tough but rewarding, leading to an appreciation of the unexpected relevance of old truths for new problems of thought.

I. M. Hubbard

THE USE OF SUNDAY*

By J. T. Christie, Headmaster of Westminster School and Principal elect of Jesus College, Oxford

I HAVE no special claims to speak on this subject. I am a layman with no axe to grind, and have made my living as a schoolmaster, but I speak as a professing Christian who, while earning a living and bringing up a family, does not forget that he was brought up to a Christian way of life and has been taught by experience to value it. I believe that we are all wandering away from Christianity and if we lose the path altogether it will be the worse for this country and for the children growing up to-day in our homes.

We are drifting away from Christian standards in many directions — ignorance of the Bible, the marriage tie, common honesty. My theme is Christian church-going and the use of Sunday.

Before I pass on to this subject, may I say something as a preliminary to all 'Christian problems' so called. The state of Christianity in this country seems to be at a low ebb, but never let us who are Christians despair, that is the unforgiveable sin. We may be as troubled, and as sorry, and as ashamed as we like, but let us never give up — for at least two reasons. (1) For the general reason that, in Christian belief, God is King, and His Kingdom will prevail though it be many thousands of years hence. Compared to the age of the world, Christianity is a very new thing. Even compared with the date when human life first emerged upon the earth it is new. If all the time between that emergence and to-day were reduced in scale, as on a map, to the length of a man's life, then Christianity would have started yesterday, 24 hours ago. Let us not, therefore, despair through impatience, but remember the profound words of Augustine: *Deus patiens quia aeternus*: God can wait; He has for ever.

(2) The second reason why we as Christians must never cease to strive is an historical one: there has never been a period in the whole history of our religion when the best Christians did *not* feel anxious and ashamed about the failure of mankind, and Christians in particular, to live up to their ideals. One hundred years ago when the churches were full every Sunday morning, what an unjust and unloving society we had, with brutality, drink and starvation rampant among the poor: and remember what people like

* This article is the substance of an address given on October 27th at the Truro Diocesan Conference.

Kingsley and Maurice had to say about that; it was to them a denial of Christ. Or go back further to John Wesley; read of his first visit to Cornwall about two hundred years ago; they were dark places indeed into which he brought his lamp. Or will you take the Ages of Faith so called—the Middle Ages? Remember what Langland in Piers Plowman has to say about the pride and lust and love of money in the very heart of Christ's church. However far you go back, it is the same picture: a small group of believers appalled by the sins of men, but working valiantly to be the leaven in the lump; feeling with St. John that 'the whole world lies in the shadow of the evil one' and that their duty in their short span was to shine as lights in their generation. That is, so to say, the normal tempo of Christianity; in the words of St. Paul 'as chastened and yet not killed: as sorrowful yet alway rejoicing, as dying, and behold we live.' However sore the straits that beset us, however dangerous the state of the world, however formidable the opponents of Christianity — that is nothing new: the Christian church knows all about it, the Bible, as Scott Holland used to say, 'has been there before.' The Lord is King, be the people never so unquiet.

Let us, when we approach God in prayer, private or public, think first of what we have to thank him for; and heaven knows there is enough for us who are Englishmen in 1949, when we look out upon Europe to-day or look back on England as it was for the poor and the unprivileged a hundred years ago. Let this be the firm basis upon which we stand when we begin to consider the pressing problems that confront any genuine Christian to-day.

And now for my theme: the Christian observance of Sunday. It is a familiar theme, not of my choosing, and the speaker is confronted by the familiar difficulty that he will be urging Christian observance upon precisely those people who need no urging because they follow it already. To these, the regular Churchgoers, I shall have something to say later. For those who never were Christians or are now militant unbelievers (never a very large number) I have nothing to say. Yet oddly enough there have been unbelievers, even atheists, who have been greatly attracted by the Church and the beauty of its services; Thomas Hardy was one. He entirely disbelieved in Christianity — he whom Chesterton unkindly called 'the village atheist brooding and blaspheming over the village idiot' — but he loved the traditions of the old evening service.

I think first, then, of those who profess Christianity; 'C. of E.' have their children baptised, go to church at Christmas and for

eddings, and used perhaps to go regularly but have 'somehow iven it up.' 'It doesn't seem to make much difference.' Such eople's Sunday church-going was probably never worth much, ore fashion than conviction. They were the seed who had no epth of earth and withered away. By trying to live the Christian fe without any 'assembling of themselves together,' without any ublic witness, they are impoverishing their Christianity. Even uppose they say regular prayers and read the Bible, they are leav- ng out an element which any human society must have if it is to urvive and flourish — the bond of community. In other pursuits e regularly recognise this bond: the Old Boy Dinner, the Divisional Reunion, the family occasion. Such things are usually ue to one or two enthusiasts, but all who come know well that he 'show,' whatever it is, will never flourish unless the members ome together. By meeting together they create a spirit which is nore than the sum total of all their individual characters. In uch things we recognise it as a truth; and indeed we really recog- ise it in our religion. When we are stirred to the heart by omething that touches us all, we flock to the parish church: we eel it then to be especially ours (another would not do as well), nd we do not need a fancy service. Remember Dunkirk Sun- day, Victory Sunday, King George's Jubilee in 1935. How the familiar words spring to life when our hearts are full, how appro- priate the psalms and the lessons sound. Our spirits are stirred and the church seems the thing we really need, with the old psalms and lessons and hymns. It isn't then that the church is not good enough for us, but we are not good enough for the church. Even in ordinary times we retain some sense of possession in our church; everyone likes to have a parish church of his own to stay away from. A heightened sense of community among those who are in any sense Christians will bring a recall to church. When the sense of community is already there, as it is in any good school, a religious service is so much more a simple and natural thing to manage.

And a heightened sense of danger will do the same thing. How long it has been since in England it was dangerous to be a Christian and go to church! But now a few hundred miles from our shores, in the war and again to-day, it is once more danger- ous to follow Christ. Suppose it was again; suppose we stole out early on a Sunday morning in fear of arrest, in fear of spies taking our names, and yet feeling that we must not be ashamed to confess the faith of Christ crucified any more than we would trample on the Union Jack. If that were the atmosphere, how

anxious and uncomfortable we should be, and yet how the old words would spring from the page — 'in the world ye shall have tribulation, but be of good cheer, I have overcome the world,' and how we should feel comforted by a sense of community. In fact, in any time of crisis we feel inclined for church. 'Crisis' is a Greek word and means 'a choosing' and if one thing is true of Christianity more than another it is this: it sees man's life as one continuous choosing, judgment, crisis: the sheep and the goats, the wheat and the tares: 'not peace but a sword.' If we could see with Christian eyes, we are every moment moving in one direction or another, the evil forces are always seeking to betray us, and the great deliverance is always at hand. Could we recapture the world picture of Christians when Christianity was at its best and brightest, then we should actually require and demand some common expression of our faith as we demanded the Home Guard in the war.

This is all very well, you say, but suppose for some personal reason I do feel this uplift and I want to go and give God thanks in church, what sort of service do I find? As likely as not, a congregation of a dozen or so, an indifferent organist and one ageing lady, who acts as choir and parish clerk, a psalm that tells you how 'upon the ungodly shall be rained fire and brimstone; this shall be their portion to drink,' a mysterious first lesson, some badly sung hymns and a mediocre sermon.

I know: I have been through it myself. I have done all the things that a good layman should not do. I have pulled the sermon to pieces: I have criticised one parson because he sounded sanctimonious, another because he had a snuffle. I have been angry at my favourite hymn being set to a new tune. I have gone to sleep in the sermon and on many occasions I have failed to go. So you see I am not preaching at you from a lofty pinnacle. I am not a 'naturally religious man.' By good English prejudice I suspect ritual and it does not help me to worship in the least. Yet I have known magnificent Christians who used incense and the rest of it, and I am sure that such things are a real means of grace to some. I reflect that if you go to a service for a community, you cannot expect a service which happens to suit you in every particular.

Being this sort of man then, you may ask, why do I go regularly to church. Partly custom: that is a poor reason, but custom may help to tide one over during those dry seasons when one's faith is slack and dim: and partly — this is a terribly old-fashioned word — duty. Have you noticed how the word 'duty' like the word

obedience' has almost fallen out of the English language? Yet believe in the word 'duty'; and so do you really. It is my duty a schoolmaster to look after the boys entrusted to me, quite part from reward; I do not charge extra for difficult boys. It is our duty, perhaps, to give your employees fair play, or in your mily to be impartial among your children. I am sure that if we now anything at all of the Christian faith and Christian history it our duty to attend worship. You may not agree, but I hope ou do agree that this thing duty remains a great reality to us, however shy we are of the word.

Custom, then, and duty, and thirdly, and here I speak more ersonally, a love of the Bible and of the words of the Prayer ook. (Speaking in Truro I may mention two distinguished ornishmen who shared a deep and lasting love of the English ible. One of course was Q, and the other was Lord Courtney, uthor of *The Diary of a Churchgoer*.)

Here are three honest reasons, and of course I have not ouched upon the deepest and truest reason of all, partly because ne is reluctant to speak of intimate things to strangers, and partly ecause I am not good enough to feel its compelling strength as ften as I should: but of course it is there — the sense of the resence of God, and our dependence on him, in the spirit of he famous words 'I will arise and go unto my Father.' But that pirit, like so much in Christianity, can only be developed by egular observance: it is not the end of an argument but the final eward of a habit of life. It is not a reason that will appeal to our oung sceptics to-day and perhaps it is not much use our trying o use it on them. They will say:

> 'all right, you have given us your reasons. We won't stop you going to church; run along. But for us, it is *not* our habit, we do *not* recognise it as a duty, and we do *not* share your admiration for the Bible and the Book of Common Prayer. Why try and get us to come in?'

Now these questions are addressed not only to me but to all who still come together to worship God. We may not need to answer them for our own satisfaction, but we must not run away from them. Every Christian must 'give a reason for the faith that is in him.' Every Christian is a missionary.

Let us develop this critical anti-church attitude a little further. I am not a parish priest, but I have been a teacher for twenty-seven years and a headmaster for seventeen, and I do know what the rising generation thinks, or believe that it thinks. I have even set my boys essays to write on the subject. Some of their arguments are silly: some fallacious: but some should be weighed

carefully by the Church if it really wishes to win the allegiance of the young. I could give you chapter and verse for nearly all the views which follow.

(1) 'If I see nothing whatever in religion, why go to church?' This is youthful and arrogant. Christianity may be the greatest imposture in history *or* it may be the light of the world. Whichever it is, it has had a boundless influence and cannot be simply dismissed by one who has no knowledge of it and no training in it, any more than Beethoven can be dismissed by a man who has never listened to music. This was a silly answer.

(2) 'Why, because the Jews kept Saturday holy, should we go to church on Sunday?' That is ignorant. Read what Christ says about the Sabbath: remember that Easter Day was a Sunday: and so recognise in our Sunday just the likeness and the unlikeness between the Old Testament and the New.

(3) 'If Sunday is a day of rest, why not rest and do whatever you like?' A nice practical point of view, but fallacious. Doing what one likes often means work for other people, and if there was no Sunday tradition, commercial competition would soon force people into work all round. It is worth remembering that it was the much abused Puritan tradition which secured Sunday as a day free of work. In fact, if it hadn't been for the Puritans the stockbroker would not be free to play his two rounds of golf on Sunday.

(4) A familiar dictum: 'I can worship better under the blue dome of heaven than in a stuffy church.' There is no better answer to this one than President Coolidge's counter question, 'May be: but do you?'

Then I come to a group of objections which touch me more nearly. Some were made by a boy whom I helped to prepare for Confirmation. His family were not church-goers but he promised to try it, and next term I asked him how he got on. 'Well,' he said, 'at any rate it isn't the done thing to go to church any longer. It needs some guts to go.' That was a splendid start, I thought: when I was a child, you were odd if you did not go; now you were odd if you did go.

> 'What was the service like? Well, Sir, it was perfectly ghastly: honestly, it was. The clergyman rattled off the prayers as if they bored him: the Psalms are quite nice at school, but they were so badly sung here that they would be much better said. The first lesson (from the Prophets) cursing enemies and gloating over them when they were conquered. The sermon? Well, as a matter of fact, the sermon was rather good. He said we were all terrific sinners — which I suppose we are really.'

e was a nice boy, ignorant and youthful as boys are. I wonder he ever went again. Can the Church do anything to help such eople? I am not asking for fancy services. People think they ould like them, but they would soon tire of them. The common harge, among boys at least, is that our liturgical services are onotonous, but this charge is unfair. There must be an unhanging framework to preserve continuity, but within that frame he Psalms, the lessons and the hymns change every day, and he Collect, Epistle and Gospel every week.

No, I am not advocating any change in the structure of our iturgy. But speaking *as* a layman and one who for forty years nd more has attended some sort of daily service for thirty-seven eeks in the year, I do suggest that our existing services could e improved : in four ways : by being made more beautiful, more ntelligible, more co-operative and more sincere.

But first, when I say 'services' you may reasonably ask, hich services? Of the sacred and central service of Holy Communion it would not become me to say much. I have been accusomed all my life to partake at eight o'clock celebration, and to many of us there is something especially appropriate in the quiet f early morning. But when, during the war, I lived with my amily two miles from a church, when breakfast had to be cooked nd the children dressed and fed, and themselves got ready for hurch by 11 a.m. which meant starting from home at 10.15 — I ealised that it was downright impossible for my wife and me to ttend the early celebration together. We welcomed a mid-day elebration, and there is much surely to commend the practice of celebration followed by a parish breakfast near the church where his is possible. As to the liturgy itself, I would only plead that he priest should follow the incomparably beautiful service, as by aw ordained, and not omit or add according to his fancy. If he will only do that and will say the words clearly, there you have all hat anyone can demand — beautiful and intelligible; more cooperative than other services because each communicant plays his part in the great act of worship : and surely sincere. I think hat no one who does trouble to attend that service, ever comes n a spirit that is sham or perfunctory.

I am thinking more of the ordinary morning and evening Sunday services which I suppose still mean 'church-going' for those who go. First then, could they be made more beautiful? Much has been done since I was a boy to beautify the Sanctuary and improve the singing, but more could be done. The wireless has set a new standard in some respects and it is right that people

should demand it. I attend a tiny country church in my holidays and remembering what has been done there, one can think of several ways to enhance the beauty of the church and of the services, and the people's sense of that beauty: *e.g.* public acknowledgement to those who clean the building, tidy the churchyard and do the flowers: congregational singing practices (some of the boys I know would readily join in these): and above all, a true pride in the beauty of his church by the incumbent himself. Next, intelligible: education has spread. Children nowadays are taught to ask 'why.' There are good reasons for every single word in our prayers and lessons and canticles. Yet how rarely has one ever heard a sermon about the Te Deum, or the collect for the day or even the Psalms? Many lessons, particularly from the Old Testament, might surely be prefaced with a few words of explanation, and the lessons themselves — more often than they are — made the subject of the sermon. Here I do think, with all humility, that the churches might take a hint from school services or radio services where a single theme is stressed throughout. Third, co-operative: I can guess the difficulties here, and no doubt at a school it is all much easier. Of course the parish has its churchwardens and sidesmen and, in some churches, choir-boys and servers. At Repton Parish Church the admission of a boy to the choir was made into quite a ceremony with a special prayer of admission, and he was made to feel he had a privilege and a responsibility. At services for the young, a boy or a girl may read the lesson and a special group be given the job of decorating the Crib at Christmas. If a service to-day is simply a matter of sitting still and swallowing what is given you, the church is competing on very unequal terms with the cinema. And lastly, sincerity: here I am thinking every bit as much of the congregation as of the priest. How difficult it is for most of us to say the Lord's Prayer and the General Confession and really mean them. And yet the fault (as I have suggested), lies in us: when for some reason we do feel stirred by shame or gratitude the old words are quite enough: and it is well to remember that it is 'we' and not 'I.' Ought *we* not, corporately, to feel bitterly ashamed of the dishonest, licentious age in which we live, when a black market is rampant and the marriage tie snapped like a thread? We ought, if we are Christians, to feel these things as though a member of our own family had been in prison for forgery or shot for desertion. Of course we don't: I don't. But that is what Chirstianity expects of us. Above all must the priest feel deeply the words he uses. I have heard the most up-to-date personal prayer rattled off so as to be quite ineffective, and I have heard the prayer of St.

Chrysostom said as if it were a matter of life and death; which it is.

Forgive me if I seem too much to play the schoolmaster. But I was asked to speak about Christian church-going, and I felt it was useless to spend all my time reproaching those who come neither to church nor to Diocesan Conferences. I know what great work is done by good churchmen, but we must bear the standard higher still and let our children and our neighbours see that church does matter and that we would as soon to pass our Sunday without church as we would without breakfast.

This is surely the right angle from which to approach the question of Christian observance of Sunday. For Christians, Sunday is not merely a day of recreation, not primarily even a day of rest: it is a day of worship. If we who profess and call ourselves Christians put this first and do all we can to make our Sunday worship worthy of God and to let others see how much it means to us and how beautiful it can be, we shall be doing more for our Christian tradition than if we complain about those who do not keep Sunday as we think they should. Among the wisest words of the psalmist is the text 'Fret not thyself because of the ungodly.'

Once worship is given its primary place, I am less concerned with the manner in which the rest of the day is spent. You will see I am not a member of the Lord's Day Observance Society though I thoroughly respect their devotion to an unpopular cause. Those who regularly attend worship with true appreciation would be unlikely to spend the rest of the day gambling. I believe that we must acquiesce at present in the fact that a vast number of people are living 'without God in the world.' As I said earlier, this is no new thing in the history of Christendom. Christianity has never operated by sudden mass-conversion, but rather as the leaven in the lump. If an act of worship comes first on Sunday, I see no objection to spending the rest of the day in healthy recreation, always remembering how much work one may be giving to other people. More than one act of worship in the day will no doubt be natural to more advanced Christians, but for the young I believe that one is usually enough. I doubt if England was really a better place when children were taken to church or Sunday school three or even four times in the day, and the other hours were spent in pious dullness — hours so dull that as an old aunt of mine once remarked 'As the Sabbath wore on and the time for Evensong approached one could say with the psalmist "I was *glad* when they said unto me, we will go into the house of the Lord".'

When people stay away from church to-day they do not act from malice or wickedness. It is not always that they are not spiritual enough for church, rather that church does not seem spiritual enough for them. The remedy lies not in trying to lure them into church by any means but in trying to restore the church as the live, relevant, communal institution it really is, and I would emphasise that last word 'communal.'

There is no doubt that the Church has suffered grievously from a change which is not primarily a religious change at all: I mean the loss of our spirit of community. My mother, for the last twenty years of her life, lived in a rich and respectable suburb in the Home Counties and I was horrified at the little sense of community and neighbourliness that prevailed there, compared with the Essex village in which we had all been brought up. In that suburb there was no need to know your next-door neighbour: the motor car enabled you to choose your friends in a radius of thirty miles. The men were in London all day and much of the shopping even was done by the women in London. When you got to church, if you did, you often knew only one person in six and the residents were constantly changing. That is obviously a difficult atmosphere for the church to work in. My own experience has been gained largely in schools, and there on the contrary you have the ideal society for regular communal worship. The boys are bound to attend: that is true, and it has its dangers (though so-called voluntary services have their own subtle compulsion as well). But it would be a mistake to think that every service is regarded as sheer compulsion. It is just one more thing that they do together: they study together, sing together, play together, and in Chapel they worship together. The value of that common worship is something more than the individual religious emotions that some boys may chance to have. I am well aware that many tend to dream their way through the prayers: still, I would maintain that even to dream for a few minutes every morning in the presence of God is a precious experience: and have we not been told by a wise man that one form of prayer is 'directed dreaming'? And where does the old boy always like to go when he comes to visit the school? To a chapel service. That is the community on its spiritual side.

Now, it is not the fault of the church or the parish priest that this priceless sense of community has so much diminished in our lives: better roads, better transport, higher incomes — they have all played their part. But it does follow that the church should make its voice heard where there still *is* the sense of community.

This is no longer chiefly in the parish (at any rate not in populated areas); it is in the school, the youth club, or the factory. Those institutions desperately need to be Christianised and the old parish church and the Sunday service can play their part in doing so.

Our approach to this question must be a positive approach. Starting from a basis of firm Christian faith and optimism, we must aim at making our own Sunday worship beautiful (for God is the God of Beauty as well as the God of Goodness and of Truth), and intelligible, so that we can answer those who criticise the church with such assurance and with such ignorance: and above all our worship must show in our lives, the more unconsciously the better.

If all those who still go to church to-day — and I know the percentage is small — went about doing their job in that spirit, men would follow them, first outside the church doors and then over the threshold: and they themselves would know the highest reward that any Christian can desire or deserve — that he has made it easier for another to follow Christ.

OUR GREATEST ENGLISH KING*

By the Editor

WE recall a Balliol don saying with immense solemnity, 'Henry VIII was a very great man.' Up till that time we had thought of Henry VIII only as a very bad man. In the light of history these two statements are not necessarily contradictory. Constantine the Great, our first Christian Emperor, exemplifies this.

Henry VIII began his sovereignty by being a good man, but he steadily deteriorated — the product in part of that absolute power which corrupts absolutely. In Western Europe the sixteenth century witnessed the breakdown of imperialism in Church and State and the replacement of it by the concentration of absolute power in the hands of the national sovereign. Yet although an autocrat Henry never governed as a tyrant. Personally supreme and possessing throughout his long reign the loyalty and even the reverence of the great mass of Englishmen, he always rested his policy and practice on constitutional precedents and always made use of legal methods in carrying it out. Much of his popularity was no doubt due to his splendid physical presence and the fact that he excelled in every form of manly accomplishment.

* *Henry VIII and the Reformation.* By H. Maynard Smith, D.D. (Macmillan, 1948; 30/-.)

He also possessed a fine intellect with great dialectical acuteness. His education as a sovereign was for that age amazingly comprehensive.

Two intellectual ideals dominated that period and they were closely connected — the New Learning and Church Reform. Henry's education enabled him to understand and exercise leadership in both spheres. Those who influenced him most in his early manhood were the English adherents of the New Learning, who themselves were profoundly influenced by Erasmus, who at the invitation of Bishop Fisher had in 1511 become Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity in Cambridge. No more noble group of adherents of the New Learning could have been found than Bishop Fisher, the King's confessor; Colet, Dean of St. Paul's and founder of its great school; and More, Lord Chancellor and author of *Utopia*. Henry was deeply influenced by all three, although political exigencies compelled him later to behead two of them.

Erasmus was lyrical in his praise of Henry as the ideal sovereign of our English Utopia. But the other side of Henry's education, theological, ecclesiastical and scholastic, was of no less value in securing for him his astonishing pre-eminence. No King of England, except James I, whom Thomas Carlyle described as the most learned fool in Christendom, possessed anything like the theological erudition of Henry VIII. His book on the Seven Sacraments directed against Martin Luther demonstrates both his theological learning and his dialectical acumen, and justly earned for him the title of Defender of the Faith conferred on him by the Pope. Without this theological learning, Henry could never have played the part he did in the European Reformation, which made him the most conspicuous figure (with the exception of Martin Luther) in the religious world of the first half of the sixteenth century.

Henry possessed another qualification of immense value for a sovereign — great insight in the judgment of character, at least in the case of men. No English sovereign, with perhaps the exception of his daughter Elizabeth, ever had more competent or loyal servants than had Henry, and no English sovereign ever treated his devoted servants worse. Wolsey's historic lamentation reflects the heartless ingratitude which Henry showed towards those who had shrunk from no sacrifice in loyalty to him.

As a result, England passed in his day from being a third-class power into a first-class power in continental affairs.

But we are here concerned not with Henry's political but with

s religious achievements. This is the main theme of the recently ublished volume, *Henry VIII and the Reformation*, by Dr. aynard Smith. Popular in style, varied in its range of informa- on, open-minded in its judgments, understanding in its treat- ent of religious problems, it would be hard to find a single olume better able to provide the ordinary reader with a more luminating presentation of this crucial period in our English story which separated mediaeval from modern England, or, ather more correctly, united them.

Put briefly, what did Henry VIII do for the religion of Eng- nd? In Church affairs Henry was no idealist planning a long- rm policy intended to bring in an ecclesiastical Millennium. He as a realist, a practical politician compelled to face effectively a umber of practical problems which were primarily religious. Henry was a loyal member of the *Ecclesia Anglicana*, and as a onsequence a loyal member of the Catholic Church of which the Pope was regarded as the Primate. The precise nature of this Primacy, so far as England was concerned, was undefined. But he kings of England had been compelled to restrict attempts to xercise the Pope's growing claims in their realm. As a conse- uence, no appeals to the Papal Court could be made by English- nen without the consent of their sovereign.

When, however, the Papal decision had been granted in esponse to such appeals, it was valid. It was at this point Henry's irst practical problem arose. In 1509, under the influence of his father, who had obtained the Papal dispensation, Henry was married to Katharine of Aragon, his deceased brothers' wife. Henry ardently desired a male heir, but only a daughter was born and there was a succession of miscarriages. This led Henry to regard the marriage as contrary to the Divine Will, and in 1527, after nearly thirty years of married life, he appealed to the Pope o have his unsuccessful marriage annulled. This appeal the Pope, after much delay, refused to grant. Henry then, on the advice of Cranmer, appealed for a decision to the theologians of his own universities and secured the annulment desired. He then, in de- fiance of the Papal decision, married Anne Boleyn in 1533.

We need not pursue further the horrid tragedies of Henry's married life. A rupture with the Papacy ensued, and in 1534-35 all Papal jurisdiction was abolished 'in this realm of England.' The defender of Catholicism against Martin Luther now found himself standing beside Martin Luther as the avowed opponent of Papal claims. But Henry's declaration of the King as Supreme Head of the Church of England ('under God' and 'in so far as

Christ's law doth allow') had, in view of Papal machinations, to be followed up by practical action on the King's part.

In 1535 Paul III not only deposed Henry but instigated the Emperor Charles and the French King to invade his territories. This Papal action was followed by a Papist rebellion in the North of England, known as the Pilgrimage of Grace, inspired by the great monasteries which were still the strongholds of Papal authority in the realm. Their part in this rebellion sealed their fate. They had become unpopular with all classes. They were disliked by the heavily taxed inhabitants of the towns because they bore less than their fair share of the national burdens of defence. They were despised by the intellectual world because they were the adherents of the old learning. Even the religious world, represented by the saintly Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, was convinced that the pious could serve God's cause better by founding colleges in Oxford and Cambridge than by making bequests to the monasteries. Thomas Cromwell ruthlessly hanged their abbots and their vast properties passed into the possession of the Crown. Six new dioceses and a number of schools and colleges were founded from their revenues, but the great bulk of their wealth enriched the Sovereign and his supporters.

The educational side of Henry's Reformation also took the form of popular religious instruction, pre-eminently by the translation, printing and publishing of the whole Bible in the English tongue and the placing of a copy of it in every parish church, not only for use in the public services of the Church but also for individual reading and consultation. On the title page of the Great Bible the King was shown giving the Bible to the bishops, who are seen distributing it to the people. This popular religious education was further supplemented by the issue of a popular Manual of Religion, *The Necessary Erudition of any Christian Man*, with a Preface written by the King himself. Henry's Reformation policy (placed upon him by his dynastic need and his nation's danger) was thus both political and educational, and these aspects of it are inseparable.

The crucial issue in Henry's policy was the rejection of the Papal authority within the English realm. Henry maintained that he had inherited an inalienable right to do this and a very strong case can be made out for him. There were in existence the Statutes of *Praemunire* and *Provisors* going back to Edward III, the Constitutions of Clarendon (1164) in the days of Henry II, the disputes about Investiture in the days of Henry I, the Pope's claim that William the Conqueror should do fealty to the Pope

the English realm — decisively rejected by that monarch. All these national restrictions of Papal claims justify the bitter comment of Pope Martin V (uttered a century before Henry VIII):

> 'It is not the Pope but the King of England that governs the Church in his dominions.' (p. 56.)

The practical issue is, of course, the right of the English State to decide as to its own religion without interference from foreigners. Henry settled that issue in no unmistakable manner and his decision stands to the present day.

But what form precisely of the Christian Religion did Henry maintain for his nation? It was the Christian Religion in its Catholic form, liberated on the one hand from Papal domination and on the other hand purged from various mediaeval accretions, e.g. the monastic orders, Masses for the dead, superstitious reverence of relics, and adoration of the saints. Its faith was loyal to the Conciliar Creeds and was enlightened by the study of the Scriptures in the English tongue.

The Church of England as reformed by Henry retained the historic Apostolic ministry and the practice of the Seven Sacraments: it was definitely opposed to Protestant innovations in doctrine and practice, whether Lutheran or Calvinist. It need hardly be added that this Reformed Church of England was no new creation but the ancient and historic Church of the English people. It was as much the Church of Queen Mary, the wife of Philip of Spain, as it was the Church of Henry VIII and Queen Elizabeth.

In order to achieve this Reformation drastic persecution was needed to supplement popular religious education. Loyal Papalists and Protestant innovators were dragged for execution to Tyburn on the same hurdle. Henry was resolved to enforce both the unity and uniformity of the National Church, cost what it might in human suffering. His autocracy in this matter astonished even German Erastians, but it is perfectly clear that no one in England could have achieved the Reformation except Henry.

After Henry's death Cranmer and his colleagues carried the Reformation further, but none of them failed to recognize that it was 'the late King's Majesty' which had initiated this great national movement of religious reformation.

It has been said that at the Renaissance, Greece rose from the dead with the Greek Testament in her hand. This was true of the academic world. At the English Reformation, Christianity rose from the dead with the English Bible in her hand. Henceforth the religion of England became the Religion of the Book.

CHARLES FREER ANDREWS

By Rev. E. C. Dewick, M.A., B.D.
Sometime Warden of Y.M.C.A. Hostel, Nagpur
Hulsean Lecturer, Cambridge

IN our age, there have been few life-stories more romantic than that of C. F. Andrews. Born in 1871, in the narrow circle of the 'Catholic Apostolic' (Irvingite) Church, he was ordained in the Church of England, holding strict Tractarian views. At that time he refused to have any truck with interdenominationalism, and wrote to Tissington Tatlow in 1898:

> 'I am sure the Student Volunteer Missionary Union is a devoted body of Christian men; but I cannot make any personal link with you, in view of the fact that you include dissenters in your membership' (p. 31).

Yet thirteen years later he himself received Communion from the hands of a Presbyterian minister; and in 1914, he resigned his Orders, on the ground that he could not recite the Creeds without dishonest mental reservations (p. 106). No less dramatic was the change in his political opinions. Up to the age of sixteen, he shared the ultra-Conservative views of his father, and spoke in his school debating society in favour of coercion in Ireland, and against Home Rule (p. 9). But from the day when he landed in India in 1904, his sympathies were ever more and more drawn towards the championship of the under-dog (pp. 38 ff.); and within a few years he had come to be regarded by the supporters of British Imperialism in India as a dangerous revolutionary (p. 193), and by the people of India as *Deenabandhu*, 'The Friend of the Poor' (p. 124). Most amazing of all was the transformation by which the abnormally shy and awkward lad became a dynamic personality — the one and only Englishman in India who could sway the hearts of millions of her people; a man of whom the representatives of Imperial Britain were genuinely afraid, both for his uncanny emotional power, his utter fearlessness, and his entire moral integrity. A veritable Don Quixote, he would rush off at a moment's notice to the ends of the earth, in response to an appeal for help from any who felt themselves oppressed or injured.

Such is the man whose life-story is told by two of his friends — one a non-Christian Indian, the other a Quaker Englishwoman.[1]

They have done their work well; making us feel the utter selflessness and heroic splendour of Andrews' life, while not attempting to conceal the very real weaknesses of his character —

[1] *Charles Freer Andrews*, by Benarsidas Chaturvedi and Marjorie Sykes. (G. Allen & Unwin, London. 1949. Pp. 334. 18/-.)

excessive emotionalism, which so often irritated Westerners, pecially of the male sex; his unawareness of the passing of time, d the inconveniences caused thereby to his friends and hostesses 185); his inaccuracies, which often gave his enemies occasion charge him with perverting facts (p. 323, etc.); and his care- sness about other people's property, as well as his own (p. 109). One of the most interesting strands in the tale is the story of spiritual and religious pilgrimage. We have already noted w his early orthodoxy gave way to conscientious scruples about e profession of faith required of him as an Anglican Priest, and the renunciation of his Orders (which, however, Bishop Lefroy rmally refused to accept). Yet he was never a 'modernist' of e intellectual type. He resigned his Orders mainly as an *notional* protest against what he felt to be the un-Christian lan- age of the 'Athanasian Creed.' In particular, he resented the plications of the Creed with reference to Rabindranath Tagore, d Gandhi, who certainly did *not* hold the Catholic Faith as erein set forth, but whom Andrews vehemently refused to pro- nunce destined 'to perish everlastingly.' His judgments were nerally prompted more by generosity of heart than by clearness thought. He desired 'to expand the truth of the Incarnation the whole of human life indwelt by God,' and 'to widen out e Atonement far beyond a single act of Christ' (p. 111). or many years, his personal contacts were almost entirely with n-Christians. This was partly because missionaries and 'Church- eople' in India regarded him as an 'apostate' who had 'gone indu.' Only a few kept their faith in him as one whose soul was ssentially Christian. Outstanding among these was Foss Westcott, letropolitan of India, whose staunch loyalty to Andrews was nder God) one of the chief means of bringing him back at last to Christian fellowship and ministry. Rich and real though his iendships with non-Christians were (notably with Gandhi and agore), they never seem to have brought him full spiritual satis- ction. In 1924, when British opinion in India regarded him olitically as a traitor and religiously as a renegade, he said to ie writer of this article 'I am a *lonely* man, in spiritual things.' rom that time onward, the trend of his spirit turned more and ore back towards the Church. At Bishop Westcott's suggestion, e returned to partake of the Communion at the Celebrations in alcutta Cathedral, but only on weekdays, knowing that his ppearance there on a Sunday might well cause an uproar among ie British who formed the bulk of the congregation (p. 211). In is closing years, side by side with his ceaseless political activities, e wrote *What I owe to Christ* and *Christ in the Silence;* and more

and more he came to be recognised as one who was not only a champion of Indian Independence and of racial equality, but also a great mystic and saint. In 1936, he once more celebrated the Holy Communion; and an entry in the Church service book at Saint James's, Delhi, records his thanks to God 'for renewal of his ministry' after twenty-two years (p. 298). In his will, he asks to be buried 'in the Christian faith as a Christian, and a priest of the Christian Church' (p. 318); and when he 'passed over,' in April, 1940, this wish of his was carried out.

It was a very wonderful life; and there are many (among them the present writer), who 'thank God on every remembrance' of C. F. Andrews. He died without writing his long-planned *Life of Christ;* but, as his biographers say in their closing paragraph (p. 318):

> 'The *Life of Christ* had never been written; it had been, most faithfully, lived.'

BOOK REVIEWS

BERKELEY, BISHOP AND METAPHYSICIAN*

1685—1753

Schwegler, who published his *History of Philosophy* a little more than a century ago, said all he thought necessary to say about George Berkeley in two pages, though he gave a dozen to Leibniz and half a dozen to the disciple of Leibniz, Christian Wolff. In the nature of things, Schwegler thought, there could be no development of Berkeleian 'idealism,' and he turned to the philosophic system of Wolff, a writer who, according to Bertrand Russell,

> 'left out whatever was most interesting in Leibniz and produced a dry professional way of thinking.'

Bertrand Russell, in his *History of Western Philosophy,* has given just three lines and a half to Wolff, fifteen pages to Leibniz, and a dozen to Berkeley. At the end of the 'sixties of last century Professor Campbell Fraser, greatly daring, edited the *Works of Berkeley*—the dreamer, the freak philosopher, as he must have been to the ordinary minds of that time. Henry Hallam (1777-1859), in his *Literature of Europe,* described at considerable length the philosophy of Malebranche, with which Berkeley's has been often compared, but he disposed of Berkeley in a few lines; and the ordinary reader who gave the subject a thought believed no doubt that Dr. Johnson had refuted the Berkeleian doctrine when he kicked the big stone.

The philosophers, of course, knew that he had done nothing of the kind, and, long before the scientists had resolved matter into energy, some of them were questioning the materialistic hypothesis. Ueberweg in 1869 thought it worth while to translate into German Berkeley's *Principles of Human Knowledge,* and the Englishman, Collyns Simon, edited the *Principles* a few years later. It is noteworthy that Simon was even then able triumphantly to point

* *The Life of George Berkeley, Bishop of Cloyne,* by A. A. Luce, D.D., Litt.D., Senior Fellow, Trinity College, Dublin. (Thomas Nelson & Sons Ltd. 1949. 25/-.)

the fact that a prize of £100 (later on increased to £500) for a refutation Berkeley had not been won.

Collyns Simon wrote as an enthusiast, and it is as an enthusiast that one the most eminent students of Berkeley, Dr. A. A. Luce, till recently Pro- sor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Dublin, has introduced rkeley to present-day readers. With Professor T. E. Jessop, of University llege, Hull, Dr. Luce is engaged in bringing out what will no doubt be r many years the definitive edition of Berkeley's Works; and feeling per- ps, as Mr. Spectator felt, that

> 'a reader seldom peruses a book with pleasure until he knows whether the writer of it be a black or a fair man, of a mild or choleric disposition, married or a bachelor,'

has added to the Works a *Life* of the author. The book is unlikely to be perseded for many a day. It has been written with controlled enthusiasm — there can be such a thing—enthusiasm which has not betrayed the writer to careless treatment of the facts of his hero's life. 'A friend of Plato but ore of a friend of truth' has been Dr. Luce's motto. He has been in all the untries visited by Berkeley (with the exception, he says, of Heaven; and s friends have a good hope of Heaven being included, at some distant date, the list). He seems to have read all the relevant Berkeley literature.

He has read Berkeley's letters, and quotes occasionally from them. But ot, I think, often enough. We shall have the *Letters* in time, when the last olume of the Works appears. Included in the *Life,* they would have dded greatly to its bulk, but they would almost certainly have added con- derably to its value. The letters of a man who died nearly two hundred ears ago, though not (except to psychologists) a perfect indication of charac- er, are the very best indication that can be had in the circumstances. Think f what Cromwell's reputation would have been had Carlyle's estimate of his ero not been accompanied by the publication of Cromwell's letters. That Dr. Luce has found in Berkeley a man as well as a philosopher, and that Pope ound in him every virtue under heaven, are the results of authoritative judg- ments, but one would like to have the means of judging Berkeley indepen- ently. Dr. Luce gives satisfactory evidence of Berkeley's manliness, and ndeed the portrait which a descendant of the philosopher (Mr. G. F.-H. Berkeley of Hanwell Castle, Banbury) has permitted the author to reproduce s a frontispiece to the *Life*, is evidence enough of this. It gives the lie to the o-called portrait which hangs in the Examination Hall of Trinity College, Dublin, and which, unfortunately, is seen by far more visitors than the Vander- ank portrait which hangs in deep shadow in the Regent House of the College. The Examination Hall portrait fills Dr. Luce with something like *saeva indig- hatio*; perhaps, as a Senior Fellow and Vice-Provost of the College, he will find it possible to have it removed and replaced by a worthier representation of its subject.

Readers will find the chapters dealing with Berkeley's American sojourn particularly interesting; and the glimpses of life in that Irish Sleepy Hollow, Cloyne, which 'is known the world over simply because Berkeley was for nineteen years its bishop,' will make readers wish for more. It is unlikely that more can be given, or that much can be added to the account of the Bishop's stay in Oxford in 1752-53. According to previous biographers, Berkeley intended Oxford to be the home of his old age, but Dr. Luce gives reasons for believing that the Oxford visit was largely for the sake of his son George, a young man of expensive habits who, in 1752, entered the University as a student of Christ Church. The hop had written to his friend Dean Gervais

about his desire to spend 'the evening of life . . . in a quiet retreat,' but the retreat, in Dr. Luce's opinion, was the See House at Cloyne. As we all know, he died in Oxford, after a few months' residence.

This is a good book, worthy of its subject and of Berkeley's university.

H. R. CHILLINGWORTH

AN ELIZABETHAN DUEL

'Literary duels' in or about the Church are usually petty, sometimes interesting, and occasionally instructive, to posterity. Most are better forgotten. Yet what is deemed 'forgotten' is indelibly written, not only in parties and sects, but also on the hidden tables of the subconscious and unconscious minds of men. If an age 'forgot' there would be no continuous History. And there's the rub.

The literary duel between Cartwright and Whitgift in the early Elizabethan era is a spectacle both for smiles and tears, both for applause and for pause. It is at once stimulating and challenging to modern Christians who are trying, amid ignorance, indifference and fanaticism, to heal the grievous wounds of the Church so that she may be strong again for her mission.

It has been portrayed and elucidated by Mr. Donald J. McGinn of Rutgers University, New Brunswick, with justice, truth and fulness in *The Admonition Controversy*.[1] It is the best single book on the subject, and will, I hope, be in the library of every theological college and be read by every serious student and servant of ecumenical issues to-day. Written without sentimentality and without prejudice, it is documented for scholars.

The subject is opportune. The four hundredth anniversary of the Prayer Book has been celebrated by many, resented by some, and imaginatively pondered by few. To undertake new tasks aright, a knowledge of old battle-grounds and fouled lands is essential. To lead, it is necessary to know. And to know truly, it is indispensable that one should *follow on* to know and to do. To-day in every realm 'leaders' tend to be 'drovers,' or 'psychologists' with the ear to the ground listening eagerly for distant tremours in the wishes of men. A basic trouble, here, for any institution! For it spells death — slow but inevitable death — by depriving it of the vision, inspiration and energy by which alone life can persist.

Mr. McGinn's book is in two parts. Part One gives an objective analysis of the background of the Controversy, its main issues, and its two chief contestants. Part Two gives representative passages from the various pamphlets, arranged in an orderly, logical, truthful and just way. This enables the reader to appraise not only the duel, but the duellists, thus reminding him that History is an affair of men, not of abstractions, and delivering all but the blind from the partisan pit.

What then was the controversy? Who the contestants? And why the present interest and significance? These three questions are all interlocked, both in Past History and in Modern Meaning. They will serve my own elucidation.

I. THE CONTROVERSY, OR DUEL

It is the original Puritan controversy in the Elizabethan Church of England, and the forgotten parent of many of the seventeenth, eighteenth,

[1] *The Admonition Controversy*. (Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick. 1949. 6 dollars 50 cents.)

neteenth and twentieth century controversies about State, Church, and heology. It marked the first systematic non-conformist attack on the overnment of the Established Church of England. The duel began with the ublication in 1572 of the Puritan manifesto (written by Field and Wilcocks) alled the *First Admonition*. Significantly enough, it appeared in the year of ie St. Bartholomew massacre. Minds, hearts and wills were deeply moved hat year — as they were in this island in 1940.

This *First Admonition* presented for the consideration of Parliament — ote, *of Parliament* — the changes regarded by the Puritans as necessary for true ministry and a right government of the Church. Briefly, the plea was iat the Church should now be thoroughly purged of Roman practices and emodelled on the basis of the Reformed Churches of Scotland and the ontinent. This *Admonition* opened with the declaration that 'all popish emnants both in ceremonies and regiment' be replaced by 'those things only hich the Lord himself in his word commandeth.' Its authors were com- itted to Newgate, and, later in 1572, Whitgift entered the arena, supported y two bishops, with an *ANSWERE* to the forthright Puritans.

In this Answer — controlled, judicial and discreet — there were two main ontentions. First, that what is Apostolic is not necessarily binding for all imes and places. Second, that what is Roman, while often riddled with uperstition and corruption, is not wholly and necessarily bad for *Ecclesia Anglicana*. The main intellectual issue between the Puritans and the Episco- alians thus emerges: it was whether or no the 'Primitive Church,' as portrayed in the New Testament, was designed to be a model for all places and generations. The *Admonition* was everywhere nailed down with texts. 'The quotations be the substance of that book,' Whitgift said later.

Cartwright the Puritan then leapt with flashing sword into the fray. His sword was a second *Admonition,* published in 1573, containing an elaborate plan of his conception of a truly Reformed Church. This *REPLYE* of Cart- wright was condemned by the authorities but was welcomed by many among both clergy and laity. Some of its contentions and suggested reforms have come to be generally approved and legalised with the advancing tide of liberal thought and democratic endeavour. For example, its plea that the government of the Church should be by conferences, synods, and local con- sistories, which latter should be able to send representatives to provincial synods or councils. Or again, its prophetic repudiation of 'Prelacy' and the love of Power: the first *Admonition* spoke of

> 'certain men of great countenance . . . whose credit is great and whose friends are many; we mean the lordly lords, archbishops, bishops, suffragans, deans, doctors, archdeacons, chancellors, and the rest of that proud generation, whose kingdom must down, hold they never so hard, because their tyrannous lordship cannot stand with Christ's kingdom.'

But Cartwright's implied wholesale repudiation of Episcopal government in the Church and the substitution of Presbyterianism was not generally approved in England either in Cartwright's time or since. Nor was Cartwright's abandonment of a struggling and still, in his time, distant ideal of the respon- sible rule of the whole Church by the whole society, acting through its chosen representatives: parliament, with all its faults, is better than bodies of presbyters or of deacons. Nor was the Puritan 'proof-text' method of Scriptural exegesis. Whitgift had replied to this method thus:

> 'One thing I must desire thee to note, gentle reader (wherein the folly of these men marvellously appeareth), how they have painted the margent

of their book (the first *Admonition*) with quoting of Scriptures as though all were Scripture they write, whenas indeed they abuse the Scripture and thee.'

Cartwright's 1573 *REPLYE* called out Whitgift's 1574 *DEFENCE OF THE ANSWERE,* which itself stung Cartwright, in 1575, to his *SECOND REPLIE,* and in 1577, to *THE REST OF THE SECOND REPLIE.* Mr. McGinn has clarified the obscurity of these two latter Replies of Cartwright, which have never before been reprinted.

II. The Duellists

Now about the duellists. The making of History — I do not mean by History the 'record' but the 'events' — is, though Providentially over-ruled in inscrutable ways, in the uncertain hands of men, governed by their essential spirit. It *was* so. It still *is*. As men are in their inmost souls, so will present and subsequent History be. An age which has repudiated puny dictators of the Hitler and Mussolini type will not accept a theological variant thereof.

The duellists were both serious and able men, deeply concerned for the cause of the Christian religion in England. The intensity of the Puritan was matched by the sanity of his adversary. Yet it cannot be said that in either Cartwright or Whitgift there was much of the saint, or of the mystic. They were both Cambridge men, successively holding the chair of Lady Margaret professor of divinity, and brought into direct opposition by their teaching, temperament, and gifts. Whitgift on becoming vice-chancellor deprived Cartwright of his chair because of violent and vehement verbal assaults on the hierarchy and on the existing constitution of the English Church. Greek had met Greek, with neither a Socrates to give true wisdom nor a Jeremiah to give humble sanctity, and — alas — with the Jesus of the Gospels almost wholly forgotten. The chancellor of the university, William Cecil, was forced to intervene.

Whitgift became Archbishop of Canterbury in 1583, succeeding Grindal, the 'gentle shepherd Algrind' of Spenser's *Shepherd Calendar.* He was the faithful and firm administrator of Queen Elizabeth's policy of religious uniformity.

No ecclesiastic since Wolsey departed further than Whitgift from a Christian simplicity of life. As Sir George Paule, the controller of his household, records: 'he did sometimes ride into the city of Canterbury and into other towns with eight hundred or a thousand horses.' Yet, like Wolsey, he was a generous benefactor and Croydon with its Grammar School and Almshouses owes much to his beneficence.

It was an age of pamphleteers, as the present is an age of newspapers, cinema and the radio. The authorities were kept pretty busy in pursuing them and their printing presses. Whitgift succeeded in tracking out the printers of 'the Martin Marprelate Tracts,' and in 1593 ensured the passing of a law making Puritanism illegal.

The archbishop's truest, most Christian, and most lasting service to the Church of England was his friendship for and favour towards Richard Hooker. The great Anglican apologist, though differing profoundly from Whitgift in spirit and in mind, dedicated his *POLITY* to 'My Very Good Lord, the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury' as 'some thankful acknowledgement' for his Grace's favour. Thus, through the sanity of Whitgift, an English classic was made possible which was as unlike the controversial pamphlets of both Cartwright and Whitgift as a cathedral is unlike a gladiatorial coliseum, or as an eighteenth-century Puritan Chapel is unlike a modern cinema palace.

As for Cartwright, he has been rightly regarded as 'the master-mind of Puritanism,' as Whitgift has been rightly called 'the intellectual leader of the Episcopalians.' Throughout his life he dwelt in the tents of polemical zealotry. There he found solace from the wounds received at Cambridge, in his exile on the continent, and during his imprisonments in the Fleet. His acutely logical attacks upon Whitgift gained venom from his fundamentalist view of Scripture commingled with an over-heated, austere and rigid spirituality. If Whitgift sought the seat of power, Cartwright sought that of logic. Neither had inherited any of the wit and humour that Erasmus had brought to Cambridge in 1510; nor had either the loftiness of More or the humility of Hooker. Both, however, were at once more determined than Erasmus, more logical than More, and more practical than Hooker. But Cartwright lacked that sane and saving sense of historical continuity which guided the proud steps of Whitgift's characteristically English mind. Cartwright was probably more at home in Ireland and on the continent than in his own country. With Whitgift he lacked a feeling for philosophy and poetry; and so the faith was not in him that one day the Mission and Message of Jesus would be seen to comprehend and to transcend the loftiest speculations of the ages.

III. To-Day

Finally, and briefly, the Meaning and Message of this old controversy. First, it is not ours, though many ecclesiastical and theological committee men continue to pretend that it is, to the continued stultification of the Kingdom of God. History never repeats itself, for we are men, not automata. The contentions of that age are not ours. Its bitterness is not ours. Its task is not ours.

The presuppositions of thought inherited by both Cartwright and Whitgift have been undermined by free enquiry into History and by new and unrestricted investigation of Nature. 'Science,' in its truest and deepest sense as a method of approach to the problem and meaning of life and the universe, is with us for good — and, I have faith to believe, for true Good. No thinking person to-day *really* regards any literature as inerrant, or *really* esteems any intellectual decision, whether of Council or of Pope, as necessarily true. Dogmas of Infallibility are treated by *all* thinking men as matter for enquiry: as much so as the intellectual dogmas which sometimes are spuriously sheltered under them. And if I am reminded that many intelligent men find security in one of two main dogmas of 'infallibility' known to Christian history, I can only recall the story of the old woman of Bath who, on being told that a bridge over which she was accustomed to walk, was insecure, gave orders that in future she must be carried over in a bath-chair. Historical or scientific facts are not *changed* by any dogma of 'infallibility.' Whoever likes to pretend that they are changed cannot of course be prevented. Galileo knew *in his heart* that his denial was untrue and that his original assertion was true. His moral and spiritual nature failed: not his intellectual.

To-day our basic trouble is not 'intellectual': it is moral and spiritual. We go on confusing Truth with Trick, and Trick with Truth: The Authority of Objective Reality evidencing Itself to the disinterested mind, the pure heart, the devoted will, is confounded — resulting in endless and sterile controversies — with human psychological and pragmatic seats of authority. The 'Expert,' who never regards himself as absolute authority but only as fallible authority, is, to his own discomfiture, dressed up in garments of Infallibility.

The real issues to-day are much higher, deeper, and more searching than in Elizabeth's time. Vestments, Ceremonies, the Government of the Church,

and kindred questions, inspire fanatical heat only in the diseased mind. In spite of all, we have progressed. We do not condemn Art: we would use it as a noble servant of religion. We do not distrust human reason: we would ally it with a Faith in which alone it can live and love and have its being. But we do not, and dare not, mistake 'reasons' for Reason. Clever men can find 'reasons' for anything. What really matters, morally and spiritually, is *the conduct* for which they want to find 'reasons.' The test of character is not the 'reasoning,' but the 'premises': not what is said, but what is meant: not what comes from the top of the head, but what comes from the inmost spirit.

It is for that true reason that the intense concern to-day, in the circles of reviving thought, with *moral* issues is really an advance over the ages whose concern was the superficial 'rationalism' either of the Scholastic or of the Reformation era. He who confronts moral and spiritual truth cannot by his very nature evade or elude any known or knowable fact.

This moral concern is finally and essentially religious. It is of the inmost constitution of the whole spiritual universe. To escape from its challenge into the havens of out-moded theology or unchangable polity, is an escape from The Living God. For that reason the words of Emerson 100 years ago are still disturbingly true: 'The mind of this age has fallen away from theology to morals. I conceive it an advance.' Yet the inescapable task of integration remains. Nevertheless, all the prophets of all the ages have proclaimed the supremacy of the Ethical and Spiritual over the Ceremonial, the Governmental, the Verbal, the Conceptual.

C. J. WRIGHT, PH.D.

THE KINGDOM IN THE EXPERIENCE OF JESUS*

Dr. Hooke has made a most readable and arresting contribution to the understanding of the mission and message of Jesus in his little volume, *The Kingdom of God in the Experience of Jesus*. He thus states his aim:

> 'In this book an attempt has been made to describe the divine drama of the Kingdom of God as it was wrought out in the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus' (p. 156).

The two great exegetical problems in the mission and message of Jesus are: What did Jesus mean by the title Son of Man when applied to Himself and What did He mean by the Kingdom of God as a description of His Gospel?

With regard to the title Son of Man Dr. Hooke sees in it the fullness of our Lord's humanity, a humanity which possesses neither divine omnipotence nor divine omniscience. It is essentially evolutionary as it is essentially human. Dr. Hooke's conception of Jesus is that so strikingly expressed in the *Epistle to the Hebrews* that although a Son of God 'the first born among many brethren' 'yet learnt He obedience by the things that He suffered.' It was 'learning obedience' in this way which made Him the Captain (*archegos*) of our salvation (*Heb.* ii; 10).

Different aspects of the Passion of Jesus are stressed by different theological schools in the Christian Church: the traditionalist Catholic stresses the propiatory function of the Passion: the ethical Liberal stresses the exemplary function of the Passion: Dr. Hooke stresses the educational and testing function of the Passion (as in the Book of *Job*: 'When I am tried I shall come forth as gold').

* *The Kingdom of God in the Experience of Jesus*, by S. H. Hooke. (The Colet Library of Modern Christian Thought and Teaching edited by Very Rev. W. R. Matthews, K.C.V.O., D.D. Duckworth and Co. 1949. 6/-.)

It is in this educational and testing function of the Passion that Jesus Himself learns what is the nature of the Kingdom of God. It is in the development of this theme that Dr. Hooke makes a most valuable contribution to our understanding of the Kingdom of God in the Gospel of Jesus and of His own relation to the Kingdom in the successive stages of His mission and message.

Dr. Hooke is at his best in his exposition where he is most himself. There, he seems to us to be in the company of that scribe in St. Mark's narrative to whom Jesus said: 'Thou art not far from the Kingdom of God,' and in the fellowship of those of whom St. Matthew writes: 'Every scribe who has become a scholar in the Kingdom of God . . . brings forth out of his treasure things new and old.'

When however Dr. Hooke dishes up for us once more the incredible view inherited from Schmiedle's 'Pillar Passages' and desseminated by Schweitzer, that Jesus undoubtely declared to the Twelve when sending them forth on their first missionary journey: 'Ye shall not have gone through the cities of Israel till the Son of Man be come' (*Mt.* x; 23), we venture to refer him to the judicious comment of Professor T. W. Manson on *Mt.* x; 23:

> 'It reflects the experience and expectation of the primitive Palestinian Church' (*Mission and Mesasge of Jesus* p. 474, *Teaching of Jesus* pp. 221 f).

and to the weighty evidence adduced by Dr. Glasson in his treatise *The Second Advent* in support of the conclusion that the eschatological expectations of Primitive Christianity were created by the apologetic needs of the Primitive Christian Church and did not originate from explicit predictions made by Jesus Himself. When Dr. Hooke writes:

> 'On several occasions he (Jesus) used expressions such as, 'when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of his glory,' 'when the Son of Man cometh shall he find faith on the earth,' 'until ye see the Son of Man coming in his Kingdom,' expressions which no sane criticism can remove from their place among the authentic sayings of Jesus (p. 61-62),

he is permitting his apocalyptic enthusiasm to transcend judicious caution. For instance, the last of the three sayings cited in this group: 'until ye see the Son of Man coming in his Kingdom' comes from *Mt.* xvi; 28 who derived it from *Mk.* ix; 1 but *Mt.* has deliberately altered his citation from *Mk.* in order to make Jesus express his (i.e. *Mt.*'s) own form of eschatological expectation by introducing the term, the Son of Man, into his citation and thus identifies the coming of the Kingdom with the apocalyptic return of the Son of Man. St. Luke's citation ix; 27 derived from *Mk.* says nothing of the Son of Man.

Dr. Hooke writes:

> 'Nothing was further from the mind of Jesus at this point than the thought of the slow permeation of the world by the Gospel' (p. 92).

Although Dr. Hooke seems to regard it as absurd there is, from the point of view of historical criticism a stronger case to be made out for the 'coming of the Kingdom' being identified by Jesus with extending human obedience to the Will of God on earth (as in the Lord's Prayer, and the parables of the sower, the automatic corn seed, the mustard seed and the leaven) than as coming in apocalyptic cataclysmic fashion heralded in by the return of the Son of Man with His angels.

Yet to do justice to Dr. Hooke we would point out that he does recognise

the need for caution in assigning to Jesus sayings attributed to Jesus in the Gospels which are not His utterances. Dr. Hooke writes:

> 'Recent researches by the '*formgeschichte*' school have at least made it probable that much of the material of the Synoptic Gospels arose out of the preaching and propaganda of the early Church, and still retains traces of the original form in which it was so used' (p. 87).

H.D.A.M.

BELIEF AND BEYOND

The naming of cats, says Mr. T. S. Eliot in one of his lighter verses, is a difficult matter; and the same is true of books. But no book could be more aptly named than Mr. L. E. Jones's *Beyond Belief*[1]. It is indeed incredible that in the middle of this twentieth century such a book should have been written. Though written with the laudable intention of defending Christianity and renewing its appeal, it reads like a parody on Liberal Protestantism of the most irresponsible kind. The Church, it alleges, has misunderstood Jesus from start to finish (and fortunately it has now very nearly reached its finish) so that His Gospel has been obscured beyond recognition from the time of St. Paul, who, needless to say, is the prime offender, to the Commissions on Doctrine and Evangelism of the present day. In fact one rather gets the impression that the only people who have penetrated through this obscurity are Albert Schweitzer and Mr. L. E. Jones. Yet, if this be so, Jesus must have misunderstood Himself so signally that the Church can hardly be blamed for having followed His example. And if 'the authentic voice of Jesus Himself' consists, as we are told on p. 123, in 'strange messianic prophesies, predestinarian assertions, thoughts about God which do not stand the test of experience,' the 'theological Pauline accretions' are on the whole to be preferred.

But *Beyond Belief* is far from being simply a rehash of Schweitzerian apocalyptic. It appears at length that Schweitzer is only brought in to show that if he can believe in Jesus, anyone else can do the same. The logic of this argument is a little dubious but nowhere in the book is its logic conspicuously strong. We are continually told, for example, that God is unknowable, and yet no less continually that the Church has formed a wrong conception of Him.

But logic apart, it must be admitted that the writer makes a shrewd blow now and then, and his pot shots at the Commissions on Doctrine and Evangelism are sometimes well aimed. When however he makes it plain that praise and adoration mean nothing to him but that 'a self glorifying God must so obviously be avid to have His glory celebrated' (p. 11) one can only despair of such haphazard shooting. Perhaps in his perusal of *Towards the Conversion of England* Mr. Jones unfortunately missed the following very relevant passage:

> 'The idea (by no means rare) that the Church presents God as "an old man with an old man's foibles, jealous, irascible, unaccountable and very open to flattery," cannot be dismissed as insincere. Sometimes the impression has been given by the unguarded or misunderstood expressions of a Christian teacher. More often it is the effect of the reading, or the hearing, of the language of the Bible and the Prayer Book by those unlearned in its symbolism; or of an education which has been one-sided and lacking in the humanities.' (*Towards the Conversion of England*, p. 25).

[1] *Beyond Belief*, by L. E. Jones (Martin Secker and Warburg, 1949; 5/-).

After this we are not surprised to find that the problem of evil may be removed if we suppose that even God had to learn His trade and could not do so without a good deal of preliminary bungling. (*Beyond Belief*, p. 13). This, of course, would be a sheer abandonment of Theism, and, *a fortiori*, of Christianity; but Mr. Jones is quite undeterred by such considerations, and presses bravely forward. As praise is mere flattery, prayer is mainly an attempt to persuade God to change His mind. In the Lord's Prayer, the petition 'Give us this day our daily bread' is found to have such an object in view, and so it has to be sacrificed. Jesus's view of Providence was equally mistaken when He said, 'Consider the lilies of the field'—whereupon they are relentlessly cast into the oven. The Fatherhood of God gives place to an attenuated doctrine of 'kinship with the (unknowable) Supreme Consciousness', whose praise we are not to sing, and to whom it is futile to pray; and on this slender foundation, the divinity of man is triumphantly erected.

Yet in his reverence for Jesus, Mr. Jones shows himself to be entirely sincere, and he is seriously concerned

> 'that whereas the puny figure of a Karl Marx can stand, for millions of young people, as an infallible guide, the incomparably greater personality of Jesus holds no such dominion over men's minds'. (p. 85-6).

But he fails to see that this choice reflects not the Church's failure, great though it is, alone; that the preference for Marx is due to weakness and stupidity of human nature outside the Church as well as inside it; that it is but a modern version of the cry, 'Not this man but Barabbas'.

This brings us to the most astonishing feature of this surprising book—the author's serene confidence in man's unaided ability. For of divine help, even through 'kinship with the Supreme Consciousness' there is no real recognition; logically, no more than in those of the French astronomer, is there any room for God in Mr. Jones's hypotheses. That Jesus was utterly sustained by His sense of communion with the Father weighs not at all with him. Presumably it was one of those 'thoughts about God which do not stand the test of experience'. Yet in spite of this and the 'predestinarian assertions' we were told previously (p.23) that the views held by Jesus were the same as those of Pelagius! But such inconsistencies are forgotten when we read that—

> 'Western civilisation no longer needs a "redemptive" religion . . . We no longer care about "Salvation".' (p. 116).

Seemingly he is unaware of the incongruity of the present situation, in which we find man looking only towards himself for a solution of his problems and at the same time nearer to self destruction than ever in his history.

But though world events appear to touch him so lightly, perhaps if Mr. Jones could share for a little while the work of a parochial clergyman, he might take a rather more realistic view of human nature, its needs and its capacities. He might even begin to see why it is that so few congregations are grounded in synoptic and Johannine criticism. (cp. p. 64).

In a book written with so much assurance, it is not surprising to find numerous factual mistakes. Thus it is not true that Roman Catholics believe the mother of Jesus to have been born of a virgin (p. 58); it is not true that the Jews of the first century thought of man as 'rotten with original sin' (p. 112); nor is it true that Constantine 'ordered' his empire 'as a whole to adopt the new faith' (p. 94). Again, the earliest date for *Mark* is not put at 'not less than forty years after the death of Jesus' (p. 106); Jesus did not teach 'that "the World" must be rejected outright' (p. 113), save in the fourth Gospel which Mr. Jones does not accept as historical.

Yet in spite of its defects, *Beyond Belief* has a significance which these only make more evident. Orthodox Christianity would not call forth so extreme and exaggerated a reaction if all were right with the traditional presentation of it. Whatever may be thought of his attempt to reverse the order of their popularity, Mr. Jones does well to bring home 'the neglect of Jesus . . . and the success of the dreary Marx'. (p. 87). It is certainly not due entirely to original sin.

There could, in fact, be no better discipline for the traditionalist Churchman than to read this book, and to force himself to read it sympathetically. From the thesis and the antithesis of such opposed viewpoints, a most fruitful synthesis might result.

Very different from *Beyond Belief* is Mr. Norman Goodall's confession of faith, *One Man's Testimony*.[1] It is essentially a confession, not a reasoned *apologia*, though this does not mean that it lacks a sound basis in reason. But Mr. Goodall's object is not to defend his faith, but, as he says, 'to bear my testimony that the Faith has kept its hold on me'. (p. 14). And it is no common testimony, for it was a singular heritage of rational godliness into which the writer entered. His father, he tells us, was a devout Methodist who experienced in youth 'as sound a Methodist conversion as ever took place'. Yet in spite of this—

> 'Most of the publications of the Rationalist Press Association were read and discussed with avidity by my father. Cheap reprints of the works of the nineteenth-century agnostics were honoured and used in the family library. Father was always inclined to credit scientists with greater intellectual integrity than parsons and there were times when it was difficult to decide whether—convinced Methodist as he was—he admired John Wesley or Charles Bradlaugh most.' (p. 12).

So from early childhood, to worship and to question were equally normal parts of life's activity.

> 'I have dwelt,' says Mr. Goodall, 'on this childhood's introduction to a faith created and nurtured in worship, chiefly because it is an essential part of the testimony which I am making, and also because it has important implications from Christian parents. If, for example, we had merely been packed off to Sunday School by tired elders who were yielding to some familiar plausibilities for not attending public worship themselves, it is difficult to imagine that our education in spiritual things would have been the same. What we could not help knowing was that this business of church-going really mattered to people who might well have been doing something else. A sense of caring about this thing and of great sincerity in the exercise were unmistakable. Again, these older folk were—or, at any rate, my father was—no more uncritical of the Church's ministrations than his children became. At home we discussed such time-honoured weaknesses as the frailties of the choir, the little pomposities of church officers, the mannerisms of preachers and all the rest of it, with freedom, hilarity, or indignation . . . But it never occurred to us that these things—or even graver causes for criticism in the inconsistencies of professing Christians and the Church's failures as judged by its own Gospel—should result in our abandoning the habit of public worship. Nor could we conclude that they made any difference to our need to offer thanks and praise to God, to bring our personal confessions and aspirations to the place where the Gospel was proclaimed and where prayer could most fittingly be offered.' (pp. 61-61).

[1] *One Man's Testimony*, by Norman Goodall (Independent Press, 1949; 6/-).

And therefore, while he declares, 'It is an essential part of my belief . . . at, by the goodness of God, the means of grace are many and varied, and t confined to ecclesiastical channels . . . Yet,' he continues, 'I know full ll that if I had relied upon these extra-ecclesiastical means of grace alone to rry me through the last thirty years, my spiritual anchorage would have en insecure. I speak with some knowledge on this matter.' (p. 69). And ain, while recognising fully that there are 'grounds for contending that the urch is no longer what it was or what it ought to be', those who have ifted away from the Church because of them have 'little likelihood' of find- g 'the way back to a vital faith, or the way forward to a richer spiritual e than they once knew, by experimenting with all other means of grace d leaving the Church's ministrations unheeded'. (p. 70).

Altogether it is a rich and varied testimony which is disclosed in these ges. Not only to the lilies of the field, but to a family cat, to a well bred airn, to an ancient pet rabbit, Mr. Goodall expresses his spiritual indebted- ss. But all the time 'It is because I have found in Christ God's gift of imself that I can be most at home in His other gifts of beauty and find peace spirit there'. (p. 115).

No doubt it is a testimony which is in part beyond logic, but not 'beyond lief'. That the nature of God is a mystery, Mr. Goodall readily admits, but t for him, as for Mr. Jones, is God therefore 'unknowable', because there a 'luminous centre of the mystery . . . the fact of Jesus Christ'. (p. 127).

> 'In Him,' he concludes, 'I come as near to seeing the Face of God as mortal man can ever do in this world, and I believe it will be in Him that I see whatever more of that Face will be granted me to see in the next. And there is one quality in it which moves me to wonder, love and praise more than anything else. It is that quality which made it natural for Jesus on earth to say, at a moment when He was more explicit about the mystery of His relationship to the Father than at any other time: "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you and learn of me, for I am meek and lowly in heart, and ye shall find rest unto your souls".
>
> '*For I am meek and lowly in heart.* Like Father, like Son. On the throne of this universe — author of its beauty, master of its secrets, wielder of its powers — a humble minded God.
>
> 'Is that why so many of us fail to see Him and to find rest to our souls?' (pp. 127-8).

Indeed it may well be so.

D. L. Scott

PROFESSOR BUTTERFIELD'S LECTURES*

After a long period of comparative security and general progress people o-day find themselves in the midst of that kind of catastrophic history which hey may read about in Gibbon or in the Hebrew prophets, or which St. Augustine experienced. With regard to these Hebrew prophets the singular hing about them — a singularity of which it is difficult to exaggerate the importance — was their vindication of the moral element in history even during an epoch of cataclysm so much like our own. Professor Butterfield

* *Christianity and History*, by Herbert Butterfield. (G. Bell & Sons, 1949. 7/6.)

considers this to be 'one of the most significant and revealing chapters in the history of human thought.'

> 'It was a remarkable moment, if I have understood it correctly, when the prophet Amos warned the Jews that "the day of the Lord," which they so eagerly awaited, was to be not a time of triumph and exultation, as they expected, but a dark, terrible day of reckoning; for the modern world has been in a similar position, imagining itself on the very threshold of Utopia, and then suddenly awaking to the fact that it was really on the edge of an abyss.'

Nor is it difficult to discern a parallel between the blind leaders denounced by those prophetic writers for crying peace when there was no peace and calling evil good and good evil, and their modern counterparts:

> 'If judgment comes upon twentieth-century democracy, that will be partly because it encouraged — and in fact erected into a system — that whole policy of flattering human nature; so that politicians could only achieve office in this way.'

In not all respects, however, does the parallel hold, for when the great prophets saw the imminence of divine Judgment, they did not merely cry out in self-righteousness against the sins and aggressions of Assyria, but were honest enough to ask, 'What are the sins of Israel?' These ancient people were perhaps less defective in self-examination than we are to-day.

Professor Butterfield does not hesitate to suggest that the whole of our existing order and the very fabric of our civilisation are 'under judgment.' Yet the idea of a moral factor operating in history is not quite in keeping with present-day habits of mind; and perhaps for this some of our historians are to blame, themselves being semi-conscious victims of those same habits of mind. For just as the scientists follow a method which abstracts all features which cannot be weighed and measured, so our historians may take note only of certain aspects of events and ignore others.

But perhaps too much is expected of the academic historian, as if his technique should enable him to supply the public with an interpretation of life. The trouble is that our secularist liberals, having deposed religion and the interpretations it supplied, expect the historians, as well as the scientists, to fill the gap — a thing they are not always able or willing to do. They may rightly feel that the mantle of the prophet does not fit them.

Professor Butterfield remarks that Lord Acton in reading history was 'deeply shocked at the spectacle of man's unrighteousness.' It is indeed to be feared that the record of man's doings is far from edifying, and the generality of human wickedness stands out rather boldly from the pages of history. Perhaps the enjoyment of social stability leads us to expect too much of human nature and to be unduly shocked at its natural lapses.

> 'The plain truth is that if you were to remove certain subtle safeguards in society, many men who had been respectable all their lives would be transformed by the discovery of the things which it was now possible to do with impunity. You can produce a certain condition of affairs in which people go plundering and stealing though hitherto throughout their lives it had never occured to them even to want to steal.'

Granted the flaws in human nature, the orderings and arrangements of a healthy society seem to help out man's imperfections, 'conspiring with quiet inducements and concealed checks to keep the surface of life comparatively respectable.' Thus the contrast between civilisation and barbarism 'is a revelation of what is essentially the same human nature when it works under

erent conditions.' The somewhat exceptionally favourable conditions which rope enjoyed until recently have blinded the eyes of many to such unpalat- e facts, and we do not care to reflect 'how precarious our civilised systems l always be if, almost in absence of mind, we allow certain of the guards e taken off.' We have in fact paid dear for the complacent superficiality of idealists, and have gambled too highly on what has proved to be an over- imistic view of the character of mankind.

Professor Butterfield holds that there exists a 'gravitational pull' in tory which tends to bring down man's loftiest dreams towards the earth. rtin Luther, for example, did not intend that the Reformation should be tage in the rise of the secular State. The men of 1789 did not dream that ideals of the French Revolution would come to be taken over by rulers ause they strengthened the arm of the Government. Nor that their Revolu- n paved the way for the modern wars of peoples; while even Liberalism nds in history as a principal link in the chain which leads to the modern h-powered State. Against this toughness in events, and this gravitational l, 'the more superficial kinds of idealism beat themselves into foam, and ng in the air as a sort of alien froth.'

> 'It must be emphasised that we create tragedy after tragedy for our- selves by a lazy, unexamined doctrine of man which is current among us and which the study of history does not support.'

Professor Butterfield has a wholesome admiration for some features of the ghteenth century. Taught by the destructive religious wars of the two evious centuries, that enlightened epoch entertained dislike and contempt 'enthusiasm.' They perceived what idealists and enthusiasts never can rceive, that no man can predict the forces that may be let loose when the ndamentals of an existing system are uprooted. The slightest miscalcula- n may, they know, release the world upon a current of unforeseeable, controllable change. For man to play the part of Providence for himself is ways risky. Metternich foresaw our tragedies a century before they came, tributing them to human presumption.

> 'The principles of the eighteenth-century science of diplomacy would have regarded as an illegitimate interference with the providential order any deliberate attempt to go further than mere defeat and actually to destroy a great state — to wipe your enemy off the map; for the new disposition of forces which comes about when you destroy the enemy power altogether is bound to be still less calculable, still less amenable to control.'

Men can calculate the immediate consequences of their actions, but the motor consequences always lie in other hands. An excessive desire to control e destiny of mankind will probably lead to disaster. It is wiser to trust Providence.

> 'It is even a possible thesis that through a distrust of Providence the gravest mistakes of the past forty years in one country after another have been due to fear and over-anxiety — the besetting sin of amateur politicians unaccustomed to the awful responsibilities of government, and one of the serious dangers therefore in a democratic society.'

Another mistake is for people to let their thinking congeal into patterns hich do not fit the subtlety and flexibility of living history.

> 'Those who imagined in 1919 that history, having taken a curve in the nineteenth century, it would continue that curve in the twentieth — those who in 1919 thought that since the world had become more liberal and

democratic for a century it could now only become more liberal and democratic still — were actually handicapped in their historical knowledge, because they had run it into too rigid a pattern.'

Unfortunately history breaks away from the railway-lines set for it by pedants and pundits. We should cultivate flexibility in our thinking.

'That the whole popularly-accepted historical framework which we have given to the events of the last fifty years will be revised, and revised so radically that the quarrels between pro-Munich and anti-Munich will seem the quarrels of Tweedledum and Tweedledee, is the safest prediction that can be made in regard to the next twenty years for anything in the whole range of historical science.'

But we have learned a good deal in the last four years, and perhaps most people would now not disagree too warmly with Professor Butterfield when he writes:

'There is very good historical precedent for a thesis which belongs to the cream of diplomatic tradition in better times . . . It is the thesis that if two rival giants are offering an alternate threat to the existing order of things on the continent, and if you are unwilling to let the rascals fight it out by themselves, choose carefully the time of your intervention in their struggle, and see that you intervene only in order to save whichever of the two it may be from being destroyed by the other. For, so long as there are two of these giants on the continent, the world can breathe; but if you devote a war for righteousness to the purpose of destroying one of them you are using your blood and treasure to build up the other one into a greater monster than ever, and you will infallibly have to face it at the next stage of the story.'

Professor Butterfield declares that he sees nothing that is likely to touch the present situation of the world except Christianity; though by this he does not mean that it is the function of religion to 'save civilisation,' or that Christianity is a thing 'to which we resort to rescue a system and order that are either decrepit or under the judgment of Heaven.' Yet some of our ecclesiastics do recommend the Faith as something to get society out of a scrape; Christianity being the means and our society the end.

These lectures attracted much attention when they were delivered under the auspices of the B.B.C., and now that they have been published in expanded form at so reasonable a price they should be read by a very wide public. The book is of the kind that one could go on quoting from indefinitely, for it is full not only of knowledge but of wisdom. One of its most valuable features is the realistic anthropology which is here presented to us. After all it is the historian who should know what has been the customary behaviour of human beings in the past — provided he does not write to a brief or as one bemused by shallow theories of human nature favoured by doctrinaires and over-optimistic idealists. The trouble with such people is that, their *a priori* ideas of human behaviour being set far too high, when mankind falls short of them, they wax full of fury, moral indignation and self-righteousness. From such sources come our ideological wars, our modern wars of religion. These lectures are an antidote to such follies.

The lectures in spite of this realistic attitude, are completely devoid of cynicism or pessimism. Professor Butterfield is a Christian and a firm believer in Providence, and therefore an optimist — though a long-range one.

J.C.H.

THE CHURCHMAN'S GUIDE TO CONDUCT

The curious visitor who stays for a while before the veiled seclusion of a confessional-box in certain churches is in the presence of an interesting custom of mediaeval Christendom. How far back this system of confession can be traced before the Middle Ages need not detain us. The fact is that for a long time, and in the Roman Church continuously into our own day, this method of directing the Christian conscience of individuals was not only in force but took a foremost place. We may wonder to what extent it was a valid and effective instrument. We may enquire whether its discontinuance in the Reformed Churches has diminished the vigour of Christian understanding and character. Be that as it may. Is there not need to-day for the English Church to publish a clear, sober, practical, authoritative volume on Christian life and duty as a companion to the English Book of Common Prayer? There is not the slightest possibility to-day that the vast majority of English Christians will make use of a compulsory confessional for purposes of moral guidance and stimulus such as the Church of Rome maintains and enforces. On the other hand, in a community where all can read, such a handbook of English Christian morality might be of real help to good living both in the fields of enlightenment and encouragement. If so, now would seem to be the hour for its appearance. On all sides clerics are busy disputing about the Apostolic Succession and liturgical propriety while, lacking maxims of Christian enlightenment, the man in the street is left to find whatever level his freedom dictates in the realm of character and social action.

A contribution of much value to this whole matter has come from Dr. McAdoo in a recent piece of research on Caroline moral theology.[1] He explains that, in the Church of England, there exists a good deal of 'theological eclecticism.' That is to say, in the various sections of the Church separate schemes of doctrine have been favoured. This has produced a condition of things where no particular form of faith or conduct can be given priority. Accordingly, the Church is in the position of having an extensive background of the theology of the past, but little foreground of precise teaching from which advances can be made in the somewhat mixed environment of modern society. Looking around for the signs of some attempt to put on record the Anglican tenets of conduct, the author lights upon a band of Christian thinkers of the period of Charles I and Charles II. These men, he thinks, tackled the problem to such good purpose that they have laid the foundations, though not built up to the roof, of an edifice of moral theology — or the Christian's guide in practice — that is definitely Anglican in its characteristics.

The commanders of this little band are Sanderson, Jeremy Taylor and William Law, though Law stands outside historical Caroline times. There are also such thinkers as Baxter, Beveridge, Burnet, Herbert, Sharp and a number of others who are placed on the list. Indeed, they are so numerous that the canvas becomes crowded, and it is sometimes not easy to recognize the respective figures and their features of thought. Yet this is an advantage to the student who would know the detail of the case as contrasted with many who wish to have an informative general survey. The achievement of this Anglican Caroline campaign for clarity in moral teaching was that it produced works in which much of the position of tradition, as found in Aquinas and the mediaeval schoolmen, was retained, and, at the same time, the new inspiration of Scripture and the sense of the individual conscience were taken into account. Hence the Caroline divines were of a distinctly

[1] *The Structure of Caroline Moral Theology*, by H. R. McAdoo, Ph.D. (Longmans, Green & Co.; 12/6.)

Anglican type. They aimed at constructive thinking, not in Thomist terms or with the idea of a complete 'summa' or system of moral theology, but in the temper of the Reformers who sought 'not to gratify this or that party' nor encourage anything 'contrary to the Word of God.' They investigated questions and cases of Christian conduct: but their measurements were made by standards that were some of those of the mediaeval Church, but others of a Protestant and scriptural construction. They composed a code of conduct that is based on conscience, but lends itself for exposition less to the confessional than to the pulpit.

The Restoration year, 1660, was responsible for the two greatest pronouncements on the subject. These were Sanderson's *De obligatione conscientiae* and Taylor's *Ductor dubitantium*. Sanderson dealt with issues of principle. His work is 'a readable and lucid handbook.' Taylor did not altogether evade the snares of casuistry, though he fully saw that what was required, in contrast to his Jesuitical predecessors, was 'a general instrument of moral theology.' In his *Unum necessarium* Taylor reached a clear position in defining repentance as conversion: 'leaving our sins, doing holy actions.' Here he sounds the Protestant note of advance from the mortal and venial sins of mediaeval theologians and their tariffs of penitence. Both these works imply liberation from the penal functions of the confessional. But the Church's right and duty of directing conscience is retained from the Middle Ages; and the Caroline moralists had, in general, a certain affection for the 'old religion,' and recommended some of the mediaeval offices as good for the soul.' William Law in his *Serious Call* is a classical exponent of piety. Law is a successor of the Caroline divines. He is concerned with 'the edification of the spiritual life in grace and moral responsibility.'

In addition to these saints of spiritual endeavour, Dr. McAdoo has taken down from the shelves of research a large number of dusty volumes in which contemporary writers of that day enrich the store of piety. It is of interest to note this trend of Christian morals away from the systematic mazes of mediaeval Romanism towards the hills of conversion where Wesley and his friends took their stand. The outcome of these diverse discoveries of the author is a Reformed moral theology with typical points of interest, such as careful insight into the psychology of sin, elucidation of scrupulous and difficult cases, and an overruling rigorism or insistence on individual piety as the theme and ideal of Christian life. Along with these ethical aspects goes an unqualified appeal to scriptural sources as the touchstone of Christian conduct.

We have pointed out that this volume is not without certain deficiencies. The stage is too full: some of the characters have got a part that they are not strictly entitled to, for they fall outside the Caroline period: the concluding pages run down to a series of brief sketches of this or that divine and his message. All the same, we think that Dr. McAdoo is on the right lines. Here and there he makes a short reference to Abelard and his great ethical doctrine of intention. Here is a path that might have been much more sedulously pursued. Jeremy Taylor is, in fact, described by the writer as 'a true descendant of Abelard,' no doubt in regard to his stressing the place of personality and reason in action. Apart from these peeps into the mediaeval past, we could have been grateful for an attempt to show that alike in the Gospel, in Abelard's thought, and in Reformed ideas the notion of personality, developed and illuminated by Christian principles, is an important guide to conduct. Here, indeed, is a moral theological concept that needs to be put into some textbook for the people. It has, moreover, the advantage of being allied to European conceptions of life such as Aristotle's view of a

man's life as a form of art, and his doctrine of the mean between extremes as a test of behaviour.

Another field that is left unexplored in this book is that in which there is much activity just now, namely, the conduct of the individual in relation to law and the State. But we do not wish to cry for the moon. Much light has been cast on a subject of practical interest in the Church to-day. We have no doubt that students will benefit from the perusal of this volume, and it may well pave the way for other efforts to prove that the Church possesses reserves of instruction on character and the art of living that it can give, in proper form, to a world which, at the moment, is inclined to imagine that the springs have lost their freshness.

J. R. McCallum.

FROM BIBLE TO CREED*

It is refreshing to find a writer who can at once appeal to young imagination and also keep a firm hold on truth, as the author of book 4 of this series does.

> 'It is important,' he writes (p. 107), 'to remember that there are different kinds of truth. There is scientific truth . . . historical truth, religious truth . . . There are, too, moral truths . . .'

This principle of critical approach is well maintained amid an enormous variety of material in the volume which deals with the Old Testament psalms, wisdom and apocryphal literature.

The general principle of procedure seems to be 'discursive' rather than the all-too-common biblical study method of 'the text, the whole text, and nothing but the text.' For example in the discussion of the book of *Ruth* we are led to glance at historical novels like *Ivanhoe,* at the moral truths of Shakespeare's *Macbeth,* and at the universalism of *Acts*. It may be questioned whether the discursive method is one that can profitably be used by children under the age of sixteen, as the habit of abstract association of ideas is one that develops rather late in the 'teens. Much of the varied allusion of book 4 would be lost to any but the most forward child of under fifteen, and, worse still, could easily lead to confusion, as young children have an awkward habit of confusing the superficial detail with the main issue—a characteristic both of Pharisees, in the time of Jesus, and of many adults to-day. There would therefore be a danger of considerable confusion being caused in the minds of the more backward.

The material has been selected, in the words of the preface, with a view to the 'more advanced class,' but

> 'since the scheme is topical rather than chronological, chapters and sections can be omitted at the teacher's discretion without any serious dislocation of the year's course.'

This is certainly true of the material selected, but the detail is in danger of becoming the source of many a 'red herring'—the bane of the teacher.

But there is no doubt that, given pupils of a suitable age and intelligence the subject matter and treatment is such as to stimulate thought and rouse the imagination. Enlightening pieces of informative detail of Jewish belief and practice make alive what might otherwise become a dull procession

* *The Bible and the Christian Faith.* (Ginn & Co., London. 6 volumes. 1949. 6/- each volume.)

through the Old Testament. For example this description of Jewish musical instruments:

> 'There was a small drum, beaten by hand like an Indian tom-tom; a shepherd's pipe of reed; a kind of bagpipes; cymbals — pieces of metal clashed together; tambourines; and a three-cornered instrument like a triangle.'

Or this interesting note on Psalm xci:

> 'Scholars believe that . . . the "terror by night" is Lilith, the monster who haunts lonely places; the "arrow that flieth by day" is the swift and deadly spirit of sunstroke; "the pestilence that walketh in darkness" is Namtar who "has no hands or feet and goes about at night"; "the destruction that wasteth at noonday" is the one-eyed Oreteb, hairy and covered with scales, who stalks abroad during the hot hours of a summer day.'

Altogether book 4, by L. C. Latham, is full of interest and life, and certainly to be recommended for children of not less than 15 years of age. The teachers' reference book also is useful and an excellent idea, well carried out, and the illustrations excellent.

Book 6, *The Bible and the Christian Faith: From the Bible to the Creed* is mostly written by J. K. Mozley with a section on the Church by representative clerics of the Roman Catholic, Church of England, and Free Church. The latter section is interesting, presents clearly points of difference, and is written dispassionately by all concerned if not always with much clarity of thought. But the main body of the book which links up the Bible to doctrine contains, on close inspection, some startling material. The introduction begins: 'The purpose of this series of books is religious.' What does this mean? The word 'religious' usually means when used loosely or in isolation, as here, that there is a wish to make 'religion' a kind of department of life instead of its whole essence. We are not surprised, then, that the discussion of doctrine which follows is largely dominated by the thought-forms of the fourth to sixteenth centuries' theological thinking. The New Testament is quoted when it supports—or appears to support—those ideas, and ignored when it does not. We are made hopeful by the remarks on p. 104. Atonement, viz.:

> 'The language of redemption and ransom (in the New Testament) cannot be pressed as though there were someone to whom the ransom was paid.' Yet a few lines further on we read: 'But the willingness of the sinless one to stand in place of the sinful, and especially to die the death which not he, but the sinful deserved to die is not metaphor. It is indeed the heart of the Christian gospel that it is precisely this which for us men and for our sins Jesus did.'

This is to commit the very fault against which the reader has been warned. This is mediaeval theology which by a twist of words will, we are asked to believe, prove to be biblical.

Worse is to come in the general chapter on the church: 'How the gifts are safeguarded.' Here (p. 121) we learn that the church is 'infallible'; and if it be enquired what 'church' means in regard to doctrine we are told:

> 'it is a question of what the bishops as a body teach. If a doctrine is taught by so many of the bishops that one can say without hesitation: "This is what the bishops teach," then that doctrine is infallible.'

I should not like to have to place crude assertions like these before boys and girls, let alone adults. We are not surprised to read in the chapter on

'The Church as the Body of Christ,' that 'we unite ourselves with him in the offering of the sacrifice of the Mass' (p. 126). Now in discussing the text of the Bible we are entitled to offer the interpretation which seems most reasonable and truthful. When discussing doctrine we are *not* entitled to hand out theories or 'doctrines' about which no doubt is expressed unless we teach the doctrine of a particular infallible church. To what church is the doctrine of infallibity and the sacrificial mass supposed to belong? The 39 Articles, indeed the whole of the English reform of liturgy, was directed against such doctrines. It certainly is not an 'official' doctrine of the Church of England.

There are some good and honest remarks in book 6 of this series, but on the whole I cannot recommend this volume. It is too full of confused, and, in my opinion, erroneous dogma—dangerous enough to the adult mind, but, as offered to the mind of a child unforgivable.

R. Stagg

BACK TO AQUINAS*

It may be asked why it should be thought necessary to return to a philosopher of the 13th century to find arguments for our religion. The intellectual difficulties which affect most people to-day are connected with the natural sciences, and about science as it is to-day the scholastic philosophers, however mentally acute, knew nothing.

One reason, perhaps, may be the extreme aridity of much modern philosophy. The modern Positivist, for example, drastically restricts the realm of philosophy to sense-data and psychological states. In his view to assert that the world can be known to 'exist' in any sense which would require an explanation for its existence 'would be dismissed as a quaint piece of mediaeval supersition.' Anyone so naive as to make statements about God is merely talking nonsense.

> 'In the place of a realist metaphysic which held the world to be composed of interacting beings we are offered a radical sensationalism which holds it to be nothing but a series of phenomenal patterns; indeed there are many who would go further than this and reduce philosophy to mere logic, concerned with the logical relations of propositions, or to mere linguistic, concerned with the syntactical relations of words.'

And even the philosophers who do not go to these lengths are inclined to accept Kant's rejection of the possibility of any knowledge about 'things-in-themselves' and put a whole range of important issues out of bounds. As one of them confesses:

> 'There is a whole range of traditional metaphysical questions—questions such as those of the ultimate substance of the universe, the immortality of the soul and the proof of God's existence—on which the philosopher has nothing positive to say.'[1]

Religious faith can find little sustenance here, and in the presence of such metaphysical negations, it is not surprising that people should look elsewhere; and the natural theology of St. Thomas Aquinas at any rate has the attraction of being a rational system offering positive conclusions.

An alternative course is to hark back to a more or less crude revelationism which lies further from the precincts of reason, and perhaps on that account is more seductive. Mr. Mascall points out that Miss Dorothy Emmet, in *Nature of Metaphysical Thinking*, 'sees significance in the contemporaneity of revelationism in theology with logical positivism in philosophy.' Barth

* *Existence and Analogy*, by E. L. Mascall. (Longmans. 1949. 12/6.)

[1] W. H. Walsh, in his *Reason and Experience* (Oxford, 1948).

and Brunner on the one hand, and the logical positivists on the other, are correlatives. But Miss Emmet rightly warns us that a price will have to be paid for the comforts of such revelationism:

> 'It must mean,' she writes, 'that there can be no real communication on ultimate questions between the theologians and the historians, philosophers and scientists who are pursuing their own methods of inquiry, unless the historians, philosophers and scientists are prepared to adopt a purely positivist attitude towards their own inquiries and to deny that they are in any way concerned with metaphysical questions.'[2]

Historians, philosophers and scientists must accept a self-denying ordinance and not trespass upon revelationist ground. Thus rational thought on religion, the root of so much distress and trouble, will speedily wither away, and the revelationist be left in possession.

But to revert to St. Thomas. Can he be regarded as an effective antidote to raw revelationism on the one hand and to arid positivism on the other? The matter is at any rate worth looking into. It is true that he was only a mediaeval Aristotelian and unacquainted with those modern developments of the natural sciences which are so fertile a source of unbelief. But perhaps that need not matter so much, for it is with first principles that Aquinas is primarily concerned, and his arguments based upon these are still not without cogency.

His five proofs of the existence of God, the famous Five Ways, are of more than antiquarian interest. First he argues, following Aristotle, that there must be a first mover who is himself unmoved. Next, he tells us there must be a first efficient cause, itself uncaused. The Third Way argues to a first necessary being; and the Fourth Way is the famous argument from degrees of perfection, claiming to demonstrate the existence of a being which is absolutely and infinitely perfect. Lastly, the finality in the processes of the world is alleged to show that there is a supreme intelligence which directs all natural things to their end.

No doubt these arguments are open to criticism in detail; but what they amount to is important. They constitute an attempt to display the characteristics of finite being. As Mr. Mascall ably puts it:

> 'As I see it, the ultimate function of the Five Ways is to make it plain, by calling attention to five outstanding features of finite being, what the fundamental characteristic of finite being is. And that fundamental characteristic is a radical inability to account for its own existence. In other words, finite being is being in which . . . existence is not self-maintained but is received from without and, in the last resort, is received from a being whose existence is not received but is self-inherent. The Five Ways are therefore not so much five different demonstrations of the existence of God as five different methods of manifesting the radical dependence of finite being upon God.'

In short, as Mr. Mascall remarks elsewhere, 'We shall never become theists if we take the world for granted.' And this, of course, is just what most people do. The fundamental affirmation of traditional theism is that the existence of the world implies the existence of a God, and moreover 'the existence of a God whose existence does *not* imply the existence of a world.'

> 'We cannot see *why* God exists or how he exists, or even how it is possible that he should exist; we can only see that if he did not exist nothing else could.'

[2] *Op. cit.*, p. 130, quoted by Mr. Mascall, p. 176.

No doubt Mr. Mascall's observation is correct that throughout the history of the human race there has been a direct apprehension of a reality which is the ground of finite being. Obscure and opaque though it may be in this apprehension lies the germ of the Judaeo-Christian doctrine of divine transcendence, and its complementary doctrine of Creation. A doctrine of immanence, similar to that of the Stoics, is perhaps more congenial to the modern scientific outlook, and a revival of Stoic doctrines in the modern world is not unlikely. But yet it must be admitted that a doctrine of transcendence has a certain religious quality about it which makes it a superior, albeit a more difficult, doctrine than one of immanence, but it is in the combination of transcendence and immanence that the higher synthesis is achieved.

Mr. Mascall claims in his Preface that it is the plain man's approach to God that he is defending, and not 'some esoteric way reserved for a leisured class of mystical or philosophical adepts.' And what the plain man wants is both an object for religion, and also some principle to explain the universe and his own life in it. That the created realm is intelligible in the sense of explaining itself is a theory which the plain man can see for himself is untenable. Many, of course, fall back on the view that there *is* no explanation, or none that we can possibly understand. But this does not give the plain man an object for religion.

It seems doubtful if a mere sense of the dependence of the created world upon 'something' will suffice as a basis for a satisfying religion, and it would seem that this is about all that a natural theology, even in the hand of an Aquinas, can supply. May it not be that what is needed is a new type of natural theology, which includes in its *data* the facts of personal religious experience? Mr. Christopher Dawson, in a recent work has pleaded for this,[3] and the provision of such a more broadly based natural theology might reduce the need for a revelationist theology of the kind superimposed by Aquinas upon the natural theology examined sympathetically in the present volume.

Mr. Mascall's book will be found difficult by those not familiar with Thomist philosophy or with modern existentialist theories. But it is written in a style which is always lucid and occasionally touched with that gentle irony which lightens the journey. His pages are laudably free from the pious verbiage with which some Anglican theologians conceal the poverty or conventionality of their thought.

J.C.H.

[3] *Religion and Culture*, 1948.

CHRISTIAN SOCIALISM IN CHURCH HISTORY

When social ideals and practical social reforms are so much in evidence as they are to-day in the British Commonwealth of nations, some understanding of the relation of the Christian Religion to Socialism is highly desirable for every British Citizen. Two admirable popular expositions of this relationship have recently been published: *The Social Application of Christianity*[1] by Mr. Guy Kendall and *The Christian Origins of Social Revolt*[2] by Mr. W. D. Morris.

Mr. Guy Kendall's volume deals with the teaching 'of the New Testament and the early Church about wealth and property, military service, trade and usury, the family and other problems of society.' Mr. Kendall is well qualified for his task. He possesses a modern critical knowledge of the New Testa-

[1] *The Social Application of Christianity*, by Guy Kendall (Duckworth and Co.; 5/-, 1948).
[2] *The Christian Origins of Social Revolt*, by William Dale Morris (Allen & Unwin; 12/6, 1949).

ment, a very wide range of insight into European history and as might be expected from the author of *Charles Kingsley and his ideas,* strong sympathy with modern Christian socialism as it is striving to express itself in our English-speaking world. Mr. Kendall's verdicts are very carefully weighed and he refuses to be positive where those who know less would be so. Indeed in some cases he seems to us to understate his case. His book is essentially educational rather than apologetic although in its conclusion he comes down strongly on the side of Christian socialism as against Marxist humanism. His verdict on the social character of Christianity is that

> 'Christianity combined an intense individualism — in the sense of an emphasis on the value of the individual soul — with an equally intense socialism — in the sense that we are 'members one of another' (for the two things are complementary, not antithetical) (p. 25).

His definition of the Christian Church derived from Caspar Schwenckfeld deserves repetition:

> 'The entire community of the Children of God.'

Not one of the least interesting of problems discussed by Mr. Kendall is the right of private property. We judge that Mr. Kendall supports the modern view that: 'all is as the State wills'. Nevertheless there seems to us to be something to be said from the point of view of Elijah when dealing with the case of Naboth, and Frederick the Great's respect for the claims of the Miller of Potsdam.

We have of course no decision of Jesus on the rights of property. When one besought Him: 'Bid my brother to divide the inheritance with me', Jesus replied: 'Man, who made me a ruler and a judge?' The situation is summed up by H. G. Wells, whom Mr. Kendall cites:

> 'the spirit of Jesus, the animating spirit of Christianity, which breathes through the Gospels, was flatly opposed both to private property and slavery, but the attitude of the Christians was never so definite. Generally they ameliorated rather than abolished.'

Strange as it may seem to some of us to-day the primitive Christian found himself able to lead his Christian life; domestic, social, commercial, political, within the framework of the Imperial system although that system authorised slavery, ruthless warfare, the acquisition of immense wealth by private persons, the practice of divorce and polygamy, the infliction of the most cruel legal penalties including torture. In this pagan society the primitive Christian found himself able to carry out his duty to his neighbour and he carried it out in an amazingly exemplary fashion whether his neighbour was his fellow-Christian or a Pagan. 'See how these Christians love one another' was a pagan comment on Christian social life in the second century, and Tertullian in his *Apology* claims that one way by which the pagan ought to judge the Christian religion is by its effect upon the character and conduct of its adherents: it makes the wife a better wife, the son a better son, the slave a better slave, the neighbour a better neighbour. The *crux* for the Christian in his relation to the Roman Imperial system came, not in the sphere of the Christian duty to man but in the sphere of his duty to God; Jesus had said: 'Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's.'

Roman political sagacity instituted the worship of the Emperor as a bond of imperial unity and as an expression of loyalty to Imperial authority. This Imperial cultus no Christian could practise: some sought to evade it but the bravest publicly refused it and suffered extreme penalties as a consequence.

The Christianity of the first three centuries had two outstanding characteristics.

1. It was politically loyal to the Empire. Christians never seem to have joined in revolts and rebellions like the Jews.

2. It exhibited no class consciousness. H. A. L. Fisher wrote in his *History of Europe*:

> 'In none of their activities is it possible to discern any trace of class-conscious motives. Though the Christians of the Apostolic age were poor, their religion spread so swiftly through every class that before the end of the first century it had even penetrated into the circle of the Emperor's family.'

Its ethical system rested on *Agapé*; love of God the Divine Father and love of man, the human brother. In order to practise this *Agapé*, the Christian did not deem it necessary to alter the whole structure of the political, social, commercial society in which he lived so as to be able to carry out his Christian duty. It is here that primitive Christian socialism differed from modern Christian socialism. This was the primitive Christian religion of which it cannot be said in the sardonic phrase of G. K. Chesterton: 'Christianity has not been tried and found wanting; it has been found hard and has not been tried'. The early Christian began with himself. The modern Christian begins with the social, economic, political system in which he lives.

Within three centuries from its foundation the Christian Religion had become the greatest religious influence in the Roman Empire. In the fourth century the Christian Religion was Hellenised dogmatically, and Imperialised ecclesiastically. As a consequence it adopted new valuations, new methods, a new temper and spirit. This imperialised Christianity is brilliantly expounded in Augustine's *De Civitate Dei.*

This imperialising process reached its summit when the Christian Church became the Papal State and the Pope's tiara the symbol of its supreme authority. In this Papal World when Christian Socialism raised its head it appeared as a revolutionary. It is with Christian Socialism in these later ages that Mr. William Dale Morris deals in his most interesting popular volume *The Christian Origins of Social Revolt.*

He begins with the Middle ages and its various social heresies. These social heresies seem to have been usually combined with dogmatic heresies which challenged the authority of the Church and its institutions. These Christian socialists claimed as their authority the teaching of the New Testament or the inspiration of the Holy Spirit or both. In Southern Europe these spiritual liberationist movements were closely connected with Primitive Franciscanism. In England Christian Socialism sprang out of the Lollard movement and made its appeal to the Scriptures. Among its leaders were John Ball, Wat Tyler, Lord Cobham, better known as Sir John Oldcastle (possibly the original of Shakespeare's Falstaff) and the Plantagenet Earl of Salisbury.

These men had no hesitation in appealing to arms to advance the cause of Christian social liberation although John Wyclif refused to give his authority to militarist revolution.

English Lollardy next invaded Bohemia and Hus, its leader was loyal to the methods of Wyclif but after his martyrdom the Hussite reformers turned militant and produced the terrible flail-wielding Taborite armies at first victorious but finally crushed by the Papal Imperialists.

When in the early 16th century, as the result of Luther's reformation, the German peasants identified Christian freedom with the cause of sanguinary Communism, Luther, as is well known, urged the German princes to slay them like mad dogs.

The rise of Dutch and German Anabaptism, with its ideals of Communism and free love dates from 1529 and although suppressed with ruthless cruelty was yet sufficiently dangerous to be condemned in our English Thirty-nine Articles in 1563 which asserts (Article xxxviii) that

> 'The Riches and Goods of Christians are not common, as touching the right, title and possession of the same; as certain Anabaptists do falsely boast.'

Calvinism, although essentially republican rather than democratic in its political ideals, was not Communist. Cromwell's decisive suppression of the Levellers and Diggers, exemplifies this.

However, Christian Socialism rather than Communism re-appeared next under the leadership of George Fox and the Quakers who inherited the Anabaptist tradition in this field. The bitter persecution of the Quakers by the Puritans in U.S.A. indicates that Calvinism was as much the opponent of Christian Communism as it was of Christian mysticism.

The next great Christian Social Reform Movement in Britain was the Co-operative Movement developed by Robert Owen in the early 19th century. Contemporary with it is the Evangelical Clapham sect with its leader Wm. Wilberforce, who achieved the abolition of slavery in our British Colonies.

Next came the Christian Socialist Movement of F. D. Maurice and his fellows, whose work was mainly educational but whose great legislative achievement was to secure the passing of the Industrial and Provident Societies Act of 1852.

Next in the succession comes the good Lord Shaftesbury with his abolition of child labour in mills and mines.

In the century that has followed, social reforms of the most varied and beneficent kind have been the outstanding features of our British legislation.

In England, the movement of social reform from the days of John Ball down to F. D. Maurice, was always led by adherents of the Christian Religion. On the Continent it was otherwise. In the 18th century in France it was the opponents of the Christian Church who led the movement for social reform — J. J. Rousseau, Voltaire and the leaders of the French Revolution with their double slogan *Liberté, Fraternité Egalité* united to *Ecrasez l'infâme*. (At this time the French church owned 300,000 serfs).

After the liquidation of the Terrorists the practical reforms of the French Revolution were embodied in the Code Napoléon. The socialist cause in the form of materialist Marxism, initiated half a century later on the continent, received its main support from atheists and Jews. It is not without significance that the strongest supporters of Continental Marxism have been the Jews.

Both Mr. Morris and Mr. Kendall are agreed that our securest hopes of a truly progressive, enlightened, humane, social, amelioration depend upon its loyalty to the principles of the Religion of Jesus Christ. Social Reform based upon atheism and materialism is bound to fail. Certainly social and economic progress owe an immense debt to the contribution of modern science but they owe even more to the influence of Christian ideals of character and conduct.

As we study the history of the Papal Church a strong case can be made out for it as an opponent to social amelioration. Indeed it was not until the second half of the 19th century that it showed sympathy with the social democratic movement notably in the Papal Encyclical *Rerum Novarum*, 1891 A.D.

Mr. Kendall's and Mr. Morris' interesting books should be read together, for they supplement each other. H.D.A.M.

BRAINS TRUST

uestion.

'If, as scholars agree, the words 'This do in remembrance of me,' in *uke* xxii, 19, are an interpolation of a later date, how is it that from almost e earliest days of the Church, the Eucharist was observed with weekly gularity? St. Paul did not consider it an interpolation in *I Cor.*, chapters and xi. What is the meaning of the phrase, 'I passed on to you what I ceived from the Lord himself' (*I Cor.* xi, 23)?

nswer (1)

There is no universal agreement among scholars, but the opinion is idely held that all the words from 'which is given for you' to 'which is ed for you' must be rejected. They are not found in the *Codex Bezae* and her important MSS. of the 'Western Text,' and Hort declared that the vidence 'leaves no doubt that the words in question were absent from the riginal text of Luke.' (Westcott and Hort, Vol. II, *Appendix*, p. 64.)

Difficult questions then arise: if it was believed in about 55 A.D., when St. aul wrote *I Corinthians*, that Jesus had commanded His disciples to repeat [is action 'in remembrance of me,' how is it that the Gospels, written many ears later, contain no such injunction?

A possible explanation is that since the Christian eucharist was everyhere observed, it was widely assumed that it must rest upon the express ommandment of the Lord, and in some circles appropriate words were scribed to Jesus which soon became part of the tradition. St. Paul knew and ccepted this tradition, but it had not won universal acceptance when the ynoptic Gospels came to be written. This explanation is preferable to that f a few critics who regard *I Corinthians* as a patchwork of Pauline fragnents put together at the end of the first century, or later, and reflecting nany ideas which only gained currency after the Gospels had been written. or this theory there is no evidence; but in any case it is difficult to accept he words 'Do this in remembrance of me' as a genuine utterance of our ord's. If they were genuine their omission by all the evangelists would be lmost incredible.

If the words are rejected, how is the early observance of the eucharist to e accounted for and why did its regular celebration on the first day of the veek become established? Many uncertainties confront us, and there is no oom for dogmatism, but it is possible that the Christian eucharist was not ounded exclusively, or even mainly, on the recollection of the Last Supper. erhaps, during the Ministry, Jesus often joined with His disciples in a meal f fellowship, an anticipation of the Messianic feast, and the Last Supper vas only one of many such meals, although owing to the peculiar solemnity f the occasion it was best remembered. When the bodily presence of the ord was withdrawn His followers continued to observe a custom which He ad sanctioned. Indeed, it seemed to them that Jesus still presided in the reaking of bread. So Christian devotion centred on this simple observance, nd the 'Real Presence' of the Lord in the sacrament became one of the hurch's most treasured convictions.

In connection with this theory it should be remembered that the Fourth vangelist omits altogether the 'institution of the eucharist' from his ccount of the Last Supper and attaches his eucharistic teaching to his ccount of the Feeding of the Five Thousand (*Jn.* vi, 26-65). Since it cannot e doubted that when the Fourth Gospel was written the eucharist was the hief act of Christian devotion, this can hardly be accidental. It would seem

that the author of the Gospel, knowing that the eucharist was a continuation of many sacred meals, preferred to take the tradition of one such meal in which a great multitude had been concerned and treat it as a 'sign' of the feeding of mankind with the Body and Blood of Christ, the Bread of Life. By so doing he corrected a growing tendency to put an exclusive emphasis on the Last Supper and made it clear that the benefits of Christ are for all men and not only for the few. It is worth noting that the description of the eucharist in the *Didache* contains no reminiscence of the Last Supper and no reference to a command of the Lord to continue the rite.

The synoptic Gospels record the words 'This is my Body,' 'This is my Blood,' and here they are in agreement with St. Paul's account of the Last Supper, and where they were reported these words must have given a significance to the meal in the upper room which other meals did not possess. But the question must be faced whether the words are authentic in their present form. They have left no mark on the *Didache*; St. Paul's characteristic thought is that the Body of Christ is the Church, a thought expanded in the *Didache*; and the Fourth Evangelist, though he knew them, seems to have intended to give them a wider interpretation than that which would connect them with the bread and wine at the eucharist. It is not inconceivable that when Jesus said 'This is my Body' He was referring to the body of His followers, but the words were misinterpreted at an early date and then the cup was taken as symbolical of His Blood. There is some evidence that the earliest eucharist was not always celebrated with bread and wine, but with bread and fish, and when the cup is mentioned its place varies. But this introduces large problems which cannot be fully discussed here. The history and early interpretation of the eucharist is admittedly one of the thorniest problems which confront the scholar.

The precise meaning of *I Cor.* xi, 23 is obscure. St. Paul can hardly have meant that he had received by supernatural revelation the whole account of the Last Supper which he relates. It is more probable that he was expressing his conviction that in giving instructions for the celebration of the Lord's Supper at Corinth he had spoken with divine authority (cp. ch. vii, 10), and therefore the disorders which had characterized the Corinthian celebrations were in obedience to the will of Christ Himself. P. GARDNER-SMITH

Answer (2)

This question seems to me to involve two distinct questions: (i) What was the original text of *Lk.* xxii, 15-20? and (ii) Whence did St. Paul derive the form of the Words of Institution which he quotes at *I Cor.* xi, 23-25?

To (i) two answers are possible: (*a*) that the 'longer' text as it stands in our Bible is original and that the various 'shorter' texts are revisers' attempts to bring the 'longer' text into line with the generally accepted belief in the Church that the Lord blessed only one cup at the Supper — in which case the command 'This do in remembrance of me' will have disappeared in some texts together with the reference to the second cup; (*b*) that one of the 'shorter' texts is original (most who take this view prefer the text which omits 19*b* and 20, *i.e.* 'which is given . . . which is poured out for you') — in which case the 'longer' text, including the command 'This do in remembrance of me,' will be due to interpolation (again, most would say from *I Cor.* xi, 24, 25). Thirty or forty years ago the majority of scholars, mainly under the influence of the then dominant textual theories of the great Dr. Hort, would certainly have 'agreed' that (*b*) was the preferable solution. But it is not so to-day. To-day most textual critics prefer (*a*). This is because accumulating evidence makes it clear that we have to account

or, not one, but several widely differing 'shorter' texts; and we can do this more easily by supposing that each is an independent effort to correct (as it seemed) the 'deviationist' 'longer' text with its mention of two cups, than by selecting one of them as original and being forced to find separate explanations for the others. Moreover, if we prefer (*b*), we have to explain why the text of *Luke* only was interpolated, and not also the texts of *Matthew* and *Mark*, which are equally innocent of any command to repeat.

To (ii) there are three possible answers: (*a*) that St. Paul received the tradition about the Institution of the Eucharist (including the command 'This do in remembrance of me') from those who were 'in Christ' before him; (*b*) that he received the tradition about what happened at the Supper from his fellow Christians much as it appears in *Matthew* and *Mark* (*i.e.* with no mention of repetition), and that he added the command 'This do in remembrance of me' himself, in order to justify Christian practice; and (*c*) that he received the tradition exactly as he records it direct 'from the Lord,' presumably in a vision. To argue the pros and cons of these positions here is obviously impossible. It is, however, a fair estimate of current opinion to say that it is heavily in favour of (*a*).

I have said these two questions are distinct because the words of the question, 'St. Paul did not consider it an interpolation in *I Cor.*, chapters x and xi,' are apt to mislead. Even though it be possible that St. Luke's Gospel was written before St. Paul's death, it is hardly conceivable that it was written and known to St. Paul at the time he wrote *I Corinthians*. Yet what St. Paul did know was a tradition about the Supper. And my own view, for what it is worth, is that, together with the practice of a weekly Eucharist, he received that tradition in the form in which he gives it in *I Corinthians* from the Christians of Palestine and/or Syria; that both the practice and the tradition were firmly planted in the churches which he founded; and that St. Luke, long afterwards, faithfully preserved the tradition, which he must have heard his 'companion in travel' so frequently quote, alongside other and somewhat differing traditions, in the original 'longer' text of his Gospel.

H. F. D. SPARKS

Answer (3)

The question raises two issues.

(1) The text of Luke's account of the Last Supper. This is a difficult and complicated matter, and involves not only whether the words 'This do in remembrance of me' are an assimilation from *I Corinthians* xi, 23, but also the authenticity of *Luke* xxii, vv. 19*b* and 20 (from 'which is given for you . . .' to 'which is poured out for you'). These words, which include the alleged Pauline assimilation, are not found in *Codex Bezae* and some Old Latin manuscripts, and would be omitted by some, though not all, scholars.

(2) Whether, as Paul says, Jesus at the Last Supper instituted the Eucharist as a Christian rite and expressly ordained that it should be repeated after His death. On this matter the Gospels (assuming the shorter text of *Luke*) appear to be silent.

It seems almost as if the questioner assumes that the Early Christians (including apparently St. Paul) were already in possession of the four Gospels, and derive their information with regard to Christian history, beliefs and practices from them. The situation was somewhat different. What we have are different strands of the tradition as they had come down to Paul and the authors of the Gospels, to some extent distinct, but in the form in which we have them (in *Luke* and *Matthew*, for example) composite and mixed.

In the written form known to us Paul's tradition is by far the earliest) a *I Corinthians* was written *c.* 55, while *Mark* is not earlier than 64, *Luk* about 80 and *Matthew* *c.* 85. Moreover, Paul tells us that he had it *apo to Kuriou* — which might well be rendered 'from those about the Lord,' *i.e.* from those who had been in contact with Him and were in a position to know That I take to be the meaning of 'I received . . . I also gave,' referring t the 'tradition.' This evidence is not likely to be put aside.

In considering the Gospels, which are apparently silent on this point we have to remember that at the time when they were written the Eucharis as a Christian rite was nothing new: it had been 'going on' for more tha a generation — *i.e.* the Gospels were written within the Church, of which th celebration of the Eucharist was a part of its life and of its regular worship The Gospel writers could take all this for granted — it was already part o the established order — and there was no need to stress the fact (if it is fact) that Jesus intended the Last Supper to be repeated. But Dibeliu thinks *Mark* xiv, 25 hints at Jesus' expectation that the rite would be re peated: 'Verily I say unto you, *I* will no more drink of the fruit of th vine . . .' — but *you* . . .

But suppose that Jesus in fact gave no specific direction for the repetitio of what He did and said at the Supper, even so the difficulty is to see hov the outcome could have been otherwise than it was. There are very strong indications (St. John's Gospel is quite definite on this point) that the Las Supper was not a Passover meal and therefore was probably a *Kiddush.* I so, that ceremony would be repeated in Jewish-Christian circles before ever Sabbath and feast. How could they forget, each time they performed it, wha Jesus had said and done on the last occasion He had presided, or fail t realise afresh the bond of fellowship and unity with Him and with each othe of which that Last Supper and first Eucharist was a sacrament? There is n doubt that the relationship of love of which it is 'the outward and visibl sign' Jesus intended to continue and to grow. Whether Jesus said 'this d in remembrance of me' or not, only the narrowest kind of historicism coul doubt that it is 'of the Lord' that we should do so.

A. W. Adams

Answer (4)

The question is framed in three sentences, and these I will refer to con secutively, making each the subject of a separate paragraph.

(1) When we recall the circumstances of the Last Supper and the place that that Supper must have held in the memory of those who shared it with our Lord, it will not seem strange that — even if Jesus did not say 'Do this in remembrance of me' — His disciples should nevertheless have remembered Him with special devotion every time thereafter that they assembled to break bread together. We do not know for certain how frequently they did so. From *Acts* xx, 7 ('And upon the first day of the week, when we were gathered together to break bread') it is natural, although not necessary to infer that the Christian Breaking of Bread was weekly, on the first day of the week. Something more frequent, however, may be indicated by *Acts* ii, 46 ('Day by day . . . breaking bread at home'). But Christianity had a strong Jewish background; the first Christians retained the Jewish week as a time-division, and they tended, under the influence of the Jewish custom of observing a sacred meal at the beginning of each Sabbath, to observe their own remembrance of the Last Supper at the beginning of each Lord's Day. In some parts, as is clear from St. Luke's reconstruction of the Last Supper and from *Didache* ix-x, Christians even followed the Jewish custom of blessing the cup before the bread.

There is no evidence that the Christian rite was called the Eucharist ore the second century; and even then, as we see from *Didache* xiv, it l had the alternative title of the Breaking of Bread, the bread being the mbol of Christian unity and of spiritual food.

(2) St. Paul would not, of course, have considered the words 'Do this in membrance of me' an interpolation if he wrote them. But the narrative of Institution, *I Cor.* xi, 24-26, is thought by some scholars to be itself a er interpolation, which secured greater solemnity for the Christian repast a time when personal memories of the Last Supper had passed away and ristians had begun to show the unseemly spirit described in the earlier rses (17-22) of the chapter. One reason why verses 24-26 have been sus-cted to be by a later hand is that no known Christian rite appears to have en built upon their account of the Institution of the Supper before the ddle of the second century (when Justin Martyr mentions it); whilst the st actual liturgy to quote any words of Institution is that of the Roman shop Hippolytus, in the early third-century work called *The Apostolic adition*. Even so, the rehearsal of words of Institution appears to have rmed no part of *Eastern* liturgies until late in the fourth century. The hole Eastern development, from the liturgy of the *Didache* ix-x onwards, pears to have taken place around the natural symbolism of broken bread, hilst the Roman genius was to develop the Mass from words of sacrificial port ascribed to our Lord at the Last Supper.

(3) The verse runs thus: 'I received of *the Lord* that which I also delivered nto you, how that *the Lord Jesus,* etc.'; and the special insights of particu-r persons appears, on occasion, to have been considered equivalent to divine velations. Thus, when the writer called Ignatius, in the second century, as teaching the pre-eminence of bishops, he claimed that he had learnt it om the Spirit. Similarly, those who suspect, on such grounds as are given bove, that *I Cor.* xi, 23-26 is a later interpolation have been strengthened their deduction by the phrase 'I received of the Lord that which I de-vered unto you' (*i.e.* the words of Institution)—taking this to mean that special insight on the part of the writer is here signified and attributed to t. Paul. A more conservative solution to the problem is that it was to St. aul himself, who had not known Jesus in the flesh, that the special insight as given. And a still more conservative solution is to suppose that St. aul had learnt from others, not directly from the Spirit, what Jesus actually aid at the Last Supper; that the Gospels do not record it fully because by his time full details of the Supper were reserved for Christian initiates only; hat *Didache* ix-x merely describes a love-feast and not an eucharist; and hat the early Eastern liturgies did what Jesus commanded without feeling it ecessary to quote the words of Institution as their authority.

There are very big problems here, which can only be settled by detailed nd devout studies. I predict that such studies are going to become in-reasingly important as another great reformation of the Church draws near —just as was the case in the sixteenth century.

R. D. RICHARDSON

nswer (5)

There are several false assumptions and illogical inferences in this multiple uestion. Only a long article could deal with it adequately. Whether the vords 'Do this in remembrance of me' in *Luke* are genuine Lukan words or ot has nothing whatsoever to do with whether the Eucharist (an anachronism) vas observed with weekly regularity. They are regarded as an interpolation y most scholars because *Luke* xxii, 19*b*-20, is omitted by some important

MSS., while others show confusion in the text. Paul's evidence is sufficient to show that what he calls the Lord's Supper — a significant phrase — was kept as a rite, not with weekly, but probably with daily regularity. For its weekly (? Sunday) regularity, there is only the evidence of a phrase of doubtful meaning in *Acts* xx, 7, 'upon the first day of the week (ἐν δὲ τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων). What is more important in Paul's evidence is the significance which he attaches to the rite. He says, 'As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death *till he come.*' The meal is an interim-meal, a temporary rite pending the Second Coming, the dawning of the Messianic Age. The question of its perpetuation as a Christian rite had not as yet arisen. Of the shorter version of *Luke,* verses 14-18 would appear to give an account of a 'passover' meal which was complete in itself. It bears the unmistakable stamp of a meal anticipatory of the Messianic Age; 'I will not eat it, *until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God*'; 'I will not drink from henceforth of the fruit of the vine, *until the kingdom of God shall come.*' Here we have, I think, the most primitive representation of the meal; like that in Paul, it was an interim-meal, temporary in character. The link between the Lukan and the Pauline representation of its significance is in verse 19*a* of *Luke,* where the bread is given a plain, straightforward symbolic reference such as is implied in allusions to '*the breaking of bread*' in *Luke* xxiv, 30, and *Acts* ii, 42, 46. In Paul this simple symbol has taken on, along with the cup, a soteriological significance, 'this is my body, *which is for you,*' 'this cup is *the new covenant in my blood.*' When the expected Messianic Age did not immediately dawn, the stumbling-block of the Cross, the new passover of the Christians, which had made possible the Messianic Age, became an essential part of Messianic theology, hence Paul's statement 'ye proclaim *the Lord's death till he come.*' In *Matthew* and *Mark* the eschatological motif has given place to the soteriological, the interim-meal had become a sacrament; there was no need to 'do this *in remembrance* of me,' for Christ had done once and for all that was necessary for human salvation; 'this is my blood of the covenant, *which is shed for many unto remission of sins.*' The additions in the longer text of *Luke,* verses 19*b* and 20, are probably an attempt, a clumsy one, to introduce a soteriological motif, '*which is given for you,*' and to harmonize with Paul, '*do this in remembrance of me.*'

The insertion of 'himself' in the last sentence of this question gives a false twist to the Pauline words, thereby suggesting personal contact. By comparison with other passages in which Paul refers to our Lord as his authority, it can have one of two possible meanings only; either, that he received the teaching by tradition (cp. *I Cor.* vii, 10; ix, 14; xv, 3; *I Thess.* iv, 15), or, by revelation (cp. *Gal.* i, 12; *Rom.* xiv, 14). The former is the more likely, though neither guarantees more than that Paul thought of the Lord's Supper as initiated by Jesus.

L. B. Cross

Editorial Comment

In its essential nature the Last Supper was the same as the feeding of the multitude by the lake — a sacramental meal taken as a foretaste of the Messianic feast which was to come and in which all who now ate would share ('I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine till the day when I shall drink it new with you in my Father's Kingdom').

It was not any command to repeat the meal which led the Early Church to continue celebrating the meal. Schweitzer suggests that the saying of Jesus about their being reunited with Him at a meal was understood by the disciples as a behest to continue to meet together and repeat the meal until He should come again and join them in it, and make it into a Messianic feast.

At the last Supper, in addition to the Thanksgiving, Jesus speaks words ving reference to His approaching death, designating the bread as His dy, the wine as His blood of the Covenant. But that the essence of the lebration did not, for the Early Church, consist in the analogy of bread d wine with body and blood, is evident from the fact that the so-called words of institution' were not repeated when the believers celebrated the eal.

It is obvious that this primitive view of the meal could not outlast the pectation of the Lord's immediate coming. In the Fourth Gospel the trans- rmation has taken place. The theory here is that the Spirit unites with the ead and wine of the Eucharist and converts them into the flesh and blood the Son of Man, and these bestow the possibility of resurrection on those ho receive them. As in this Gospel the coming of the Spirit takes the place the speedy advent of the Messiah, so the union of the Spirit with the read and wine, and their consequent conversion into the body and blood of hrist, take the place of the returned Christ presiding at the Messianic meal.

But since the Spirit has his being in the world only *after* the death and surrection of Jesus, 'it is for the author of the Fourth Gospel unthinkable at Jesus Himself at the last meal with His disciples should have given them read and wine as His body and blood.' Thus, since what the Synoptists elate was incompatible with his view of things, the Johannine author omitted eir account of the Last Supper as due to an erroneous tradition, and sub- ituted for it an account of another sacrament — that of washing, or baptism.

J. C. HARDWICK

CORRESPONDENCE

THE ROAD TO ENDOR

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman*

SIR,

Many besides myself will have read with interest and appreciation the Rev. J. D. Pearce-Higgin's Conference paper on 'The Occult and the Psychic.' One feels, however, that it is easy to exaggerate the importance or religion — or at least for the Christian religion — of abnormal phenomena f the kinds there described. Telepathy, precognition and similar phenomena lo not seem to me to destroy the uniformity of nature; they merely extend ur knowledge of nature, and the facts thus classified are facts of science. It nay be said that they contradict materialism, which is hostile to religion, but he physicist has done the same thing, and metaphysics has disposed of naterialism, as a theory to be taken seriously, long ago.

So far as one can understand them, it would appear that these phenomena re to be associated with the activity of the subconscious mind. But it is a oint to consider whether such subconscious mental activities may not belong rimarily to a stage of human evolution which can only be regarded as rimitive. The medicine-man or witch-doctor of primitive tribes may be an dept in this kind of thing, not because he is ahead of civilized man, but be- ause he lags behind him. We may imitate his music and so decivilize our- elves in one direction, but we need not take up his witchcraft, which would arry us even further along the road to perdition.

The Old Testament supplies plenty of evidence of the practice of divina- ion, of telepathy and the use of abnormal and occult powers. But it is not vithout significance that the prophetic literature condemns it as unworthy of n ethical and spiritual religion.

'And when they shall say unto you, Seek unto them that have familiar

spirits and unto the wizards that chirp and that mutter: should not a people seek unto their God? On behalf of the living should they seek unto the dead?' (*Isaiah* viii, 19.)

Nor is it at all certain that deception and trickery were not the stock-in-trade of some of the adepts of those days as in our own. Sir James Frazer in his *Folk-lore in the Old Testament* has pointed out that on the famous occasion when Saul visited the witch of Endor he himself did not see the evoked spirit of Samuel. It was the woman who described to him what *she* saw—or said she saw: 'An old man cometh up and he is covered with a robe.' The words which follow, 'And Saul perceived that it was Samuel,' mean that from her description he concluded that it was he whose coming he had asked her to secure. It is true that Saul heard, or thought he heard, the spirit speak. But ventriloquism, as Sir James suggests, was an art not unknown to practitioners of the occult.

It may indeed be urged that these phenomena of an abnormal kind render more easy or certain a belief in human survival. But, as a friend's letter put it to me, 'If survival can be proved by empirical methods, it is an interesting *scientific fact,* as our present existence is: but it has no religious significance as such, nor does it verify any religious belief.' The fact of my present existence has no religious significance. What has that significance is its source, purpose and quality. In like manner my existence after death has no religious significance apart from its purpose and quality, and about this psychic revelations can tell us nothing. All they can do, as Dean Inge has observed, is to add a fresh terror to death.

J. C. HARDWICK

SHAKESPEARE AND REINCARNATION

SIR,

I must apologise to Mr. Coddington and the rest of your readers for the loose wording of my previous letter. When I said that Shakespeare had 'ignored' the doctrine of Reincarnation and Pre-existence, I meant he refused to treat the subject seriously. He pitched on its weakest link, which presumably no Christian would accept anyway, the supposition that the souls of human beings could be re-incarnated in the bodies of animals or vice-versa, and made a mock of it. Consequently in the three cases quoted he is either clowning or spitting venom. There is never any attempt to discuss the doctrine deeply or reasonably. His own beliefs, of course, were very different:

'Out, out, brief candle!
Life's but a walking shadow, a poor player
That struts and frets his hour upon the stage,
And then is heard no more.'

Blatherwycke Rectory,
Peterborough.

A. TINDAL HART

CORRECTION

On page 285, last line and 13 lines above, read *Antipas* for *Agrippa*.

Dr. Eisler wishes the following paragraph to be inserted into his letter, 'Hebrew Scrolls,' p. 286, 20 lines from the top:

'Moreover, the *Hōdayoth* or "Songs of Praise" of "the Sons of Light," discovered in the cave in question by Prof. Sukenik are attributed in the MS. itself, to "the Teacher of Righteousness" mentioned in the Damascus script (discovered by Dr. Schachter) whom I claim to have identified with John the Baptist in my monograph on this document in the anniversary volume for Dr. Moses Gasper, London, 1937.'